DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 898 HE 008 214

AUTHOR Litwin, James; And Others
TITLE The University Seminar Program: A Formative Evaluation of the First Year.
INSTITUTION Bowling Green State Univ., Ohio. Div. of General Studies.
PUB DATE Jul 76
NOTE 99p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Freshmen; College Students; Enrollment Influences; *Higher Education; *Orientation Materials; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *School Orientation; State Universities; Student Enrollment; Student Mobility; Student Opinion; *Student Seminars; Summative Evaluation; *Transfer Students
IDENTIFIERS Bowling Green State University

ABSTRACT

In the Fall Quarter, 1975, the University Division of General Studies introduced a University Seminar Program whose aim was to provide new students, freshmen and transfers, with a more humanistic introduction to Bowling Green State University. The results and conclusions of the evaluation study regarding the first year of the program's operation are presented. Procedures of the program are identified along with a profile of the students and the seminar, its impact on students, and student and mentor ratings of the seminar. It is suggested that the seminar was moderately successful, and nine recommendations for changes and modifications to the concept are offered. They include advice regarding clearer statement of seminar goals, communication to students of seminar expectations, mentor preparation, structure for resource persons, early introduction of student projects, review of seminar readings and topic sequence, more focused evaluation, and consultation with others. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED127898

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

2

The University Seminar Program:

A Formative Evaluation of the

First Year

James Litwin
Richard Burke
Ronald Stoner

July, 1976

FOREWORD

In the Fall Quarter, 1975, the University Division of General Studies introduced a project of considerable scope to the BGSU community: the University Seminar Program. According to the proposal for the Program, the purpose of the Seminar would be "to provide new students, both freshmen and transfers, with a more humanistic introduction to Bowling Green State University." The development of the program, according to its creators, would result in an "improved educational environment" at the University.

With these ambitious purposes in mind, the University Seminar Program was launched with the understanding that, after a two-year trial period, the program would become incorporated into the permanent University offerings, if appropriate councils determined that it contributed to the overall goals and objectives of the University. The purpose of this report is to convey to the University community the results and conclusions of the evaluation study completed regarding the first year of the program's operation. The study, itself, was conducted at the behest of the University Seminar Program Committee, the general policy-making body for the Seminar, and of the University Division of General Studies and its Advisory Council.

We are pleased to acknowledge our debt, in general, to all of the faculty, staff, and student mentors in the University Seminar Program who patiently persevered with us in the substantial data collection and reporting efforts required for this report. We especially recognize the contribution of George Adams, Karen Babyak, and Diane Whitmire in the compilation and analysis of the data and the preparation of this report.

James Litwin
Richard Burke
Ronald Stoner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword

Section		Page
I.	INTROLUCTION.	1
	Background on the University Seminar Plan of the Report	
II.	PROCEDURE	7
	Methods	
III.	A PROFILE OF THE STUDENTS AND THE SEMINAR	12
	University-wide Impact of the Seminar on Student Enrollment Patterns	
IV.	IMPACT ON STUDENTS.	26
	Student Perceptions of Outcomes In What Ways Did Students Change? On Student Change	
V.	STUDENT AND MENTOR RATINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY SEMINAR.	48
	How Did Students Rate the Seminar? How Did Mentors Summarize the Seminar Experience? Representative Comments	
VI.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	60
	Major Findings Limitations Conclusions Recommendations	
	APPENDIX.	73

INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of a new program in a university setting is not a simple task; it must meet certain standards of fairness, precision, and objectivity; it must respond to important deviations and adaptations not anticipated; and, it must deal with untried definitions and new constructs. Above all, the evaluators must be explicit about their aims and intentions (as well as their potential effects on the observed) in order to minimize the always present criticism of both the supporters and the critics of the program being evaluated. Toward this end, we have devoted this first section to transmitting our philosophy and aims regarding the evaluation of the University Seminar.

As a general rule, the evaluation of the University Seminar proceeded along the lines recommended in the program proposal:

> Given the stated goals and objectives of this proposed program, an evaluation of it should assess the impact of the University Seminar on new students. The evaluation design should concentrate on the articulated goals and objectives. The purpose of the evaluation would be formative -- to gather information that should continue to improve the seminar experience (p.9).

While we felt that this guideline, in general, should dictate the direction of the evaluation, we also felt it fell short of stating two other criteria the evaluation should meet: comprehensiveness and an assessment beyond the "product" implications of the Seminar. Our reasons for this are stated below. First, we thought the evaluation should be as comprehensive as possible so as to detect both "unanticipated" outcomes of the original proposal and outcomes resulting from subsequent adaptations and deviations.

We thought it was important to recognize that there would be a less than perfect match between what was planned and what actually happened. A neglect of the probability of this occurence would most likely result in the evaluation of a program which really didn't exist. Second, we thought the evaluation plan should not only attempt to assess the "product" or outcomes of the Seminar, but also describe the dynamic of the program. While we had no specific plans for establishing causal relationships between what happened and how it happened, we did feel that data properly gathered might well speak for itself. Realistically, we saw this direction as the only one by which we would be able to cite recommendations for constructive changes in light of the program's achieved goals.

Background on the University Seminar

The development of the University Seminar Program had at least two direct sources. Its development was recommended by Dr. Michael Marsden during his participation in a quarter-long symposium entitled "The Future of Education at Bowling Green State University", and in an evaluation study of the BGSU Pre-registration and Orientation Program completed by the University Division of General Studies (Fall, 1974). As a result of Dr. Marsden's interest and that of the University Division staff, a committee was set up to consider the possibilities of a "freshman seminar" at BGSU. This committee eventually became the University Seminar Program Committee and drew up the proposal (revised in July, 1975), the ultimate "working paper" for the University Seminar Program. An abstract of that proposal is included as Appendix A of this report; a brief description of the University Seminar from that abstract follows:

Goals and Objectives:

The purpose of the University Seminar is to provide new students, both freshmen and transfer, with a more humanistic introduction to Bowling Green State University than they previously received, by organizing them with a small group of peers, a faculty member, a staff member and an upperclass student. The mentor team, composed of the faculty member, staff member and upperclass student, serves as a resource group interested in the individual student's needs and objectives.

The program also serves to develop a student's self awareness through articulation of individual goals and objectives of their individual educational experience and how it may relate to future plans. The program also attempts to develop an awareness of how the individual can maximize his/her use of the institution, its curriculum, and its resources to the fullest extent -- thus meeting personal goals and objectives. And finally, the program provides new students with a forum within which to share their opinions, concerns, and questions concerning the college experience.

An Overview of the Program:

1. The seminar carries two credit hours and students are encouraged to exercise their S-U option.

2. The seminars are scheduled during normal class hours.

3. The size of each seminar is approximately twenty students.

4. An evaluation system utilized to insure information necessary for any reformulation is available.

5. Faculty, staff, and upperclass students acting as mentors, while not receiving pay for their services, receive appropriate recognition.

General Syllabus:

The following syllabus is suggested as a guideline for use by each of the mentor teams. The topics are in an order found useful by some mentors but are interchangeable depending on timeliness and availability of resource people.

Introduction centering around discussion of the goals and objectives of the seminar.

Support services available to students (i.e. Personal Development and Life Planning Center, Fact Line, etc.) and available "hardware" on campus such as audio centers, etc.

Recreational and avocational skills that will develop the foundation for lifelong learning to occur.

Classroom dynamics, different teaching techniques, grades, competition, and test taking.

A discussion of how general education (group requirements) can be a meaningful part of a student's total educational experience along with how a student can exercise his/her options in the existing structure.

The administrative organization of the University and proper channels to obtain information and present proposals, requests, or appeals.

General decision-making processes and how these can be applied to making a career choice. Exploration of various campus opportunities in career development. Discussion of academic advising structure.

The functions of higher education and nature of a University. Students are encouraged to consider their attitudes and values about education.

Free week where more indepth discussion/debate of one or more of the previous topics can occur.

Sharing of individual student projects and conclusion. Commentary by the group.

The University Seminar was offered for the first time in the Fall Quarter, 1975 as University Division 121 under the general direction of Dr. Michael Marsden and the University Seminar Program Committee. The 75 faculty, staff, and students who acted as mentors in the program represented considerable diversity across department, college, and office (mentors are listed in Appendix B).

The University Seminar has been the subject of some debate during the past year as BGSU faculty have argued about its propriety, its impact, its role, and its future in a University trying to come to grips with a "steady-state" situation. The points of debate are considerable and we will not go into them here except to characterize one major perceptual difference regarding the nature of the University Seminar. In brief, while one group views the Seminar as a "super-orientation" course with questionable

academic content, another group views the Seminar as maximizing the student experience at BGSU through an expanded perception of the nature of the University and the student's role in that University. We do not know either the distribution or the relative intensity of these two points of view. Hopefully, this report will clarify some of that imagined reality wherever it exists.

Plan of the Report

Outside of section II, which is devoted to an explanation of the procedure and methods followed in the study, the information collected on the Seminar has been organized into three parts, each of them responding to a set of questions, the answers to which we viewed as pertinent in understanding the achievements and dynamics of the Seminar.

Section III responds to a set of questions focused on providing a profile of how the Seminar actually was implemented by the 25 mentor teams and the characteristics of the students who enrolled in the Seminar. We felt it important to know why students enrolled in the Seminar and what they expected of the Seminar since a great deal of dissatisfaction or frustration, if found, might be a result of either unrealistic or misinformed expectations. Because students had no knowledge of peer perceptions of the course through the "grapevine", we felt there was a great likelihood of incongruent expectations occurring.

Section IV is an assessment of the "impact" of the Seminar on students; more precisely, it is an assessment of the changes occurring in students who took the Seminar during Fall Quarter. In this section we have presented information on what students perceived they "got out of the Seminar," but have attempted to go beyond these perceptions by assessing student change on

constructs of educational autonomy and various attitudes toward academe. Experimental measures designed to assess student changes on their ability to articulate "academic plans," to consider the characteristics of an "educated person," and to understand how the student defines his/her "relationship to the University" are also explored. No attempt is made to partial out the influence of the Seminar from other student experiences.

Section V responds to a series of questions about how both students and mentors evaluated the Seminar. How did students rate the Seminar's effectiveness? How did students judge the mentor team concept? At the same time, we were interested in mentor perceptions about the Seminar. What was the basic character of their individual Seminar? What would they do differently?

In the last section of the report we review the major findings of the report, discuss limitations, draw conclusions and make a number of recommendations based on the findings. One could argue that we have done too much, gathered too much data, but we think not. There is much more we would like to have known about, other questions we would like to have explored, interviews we would like to have done, other measures we would like to have utilized; but we did face time and resource constraints. The fact that we gathered data from several sources at several times has allowed us to check and recheck the data and our subsequent presentations to the point where we are reasonably certain of their accuracy, if not always of their proper interpretation.

Section II

PROCEDURE

The abbreviated time available to plan the evaluation of the Seminar was one constraint we faced; however, the more perplexing problem to consider was the many unknowns we confronted. What would the Seminar ultimately look like? How many students were going to be involved? What did constructs such as "educational autonomy" and "academic plans" mean? How could they be operationalized? Which students would take the Seminar?

Since we knew of no previous attempts to mount a similar program at BGSU, and considered the aspirations of the Seminar different from the usual one-credit freshman orientation course offered at other universities, we started with only our two general goals: 1) To assess the outcomes of the course for the student, and 2) To describe what occurred in the University Seminar.

The first of these two tasks struck us as the more difficult, given the ambiguity of the anticipated student outcomes and the availability of few measurement tools.

We thus chose to limit our investigation to looking only at selected outcomes based on the "Profile of a Student Completing the University Seminar Program" as stated in the proposal (p.2). Those concepts which appeared central to us were the following:

1. "a student who completed the University Seminar will be <u>better</u> able to articulate his/her academic plans"
2. "students would be knowledgeable about...requirements and opportunities available to him/her and "more aware of the numerous academic options"
3. "a student would be better able to understand his/her relationship to this institution"

While the above goals could be "lifted" from the proposal, we felt there were several other goals of the Seminar stated less directly. These were:

"a humanistic introduction to BGSU"

"would hopefully lessen some of the anxieties that seem to be inherent in new students"

"an awareness of how the individual can maximize his/her use of the institution"

"provide new students with a forum within which to share their opinions, concerns, and questions concerning the college experience"

discussion of "the nature of an educated person"

All of the above goals and concepts formed the core of the evaluation. Explanations regarding how they were "operationalized" have been restricted to sections in which results are reported and discussed.

Methods

During the months of August and September (1975) we devoted considerable time to 1) planning a feasible research design, 2) constructing instruments, and 3) finalizing plans for the evaluation.

We decided that the best "design" under the circumstances would be one in which we took measures of the students both before and after the Seminar since goals which asserted "more" or "better" required some measure of change or comparison beyond the student's own perceptions of change. Our decision, therefore, was to administer to Seminar students similar survey questionnaires on a pre and post basis. While ideally we would have included a control group, we were somewhat puzzled by what the nature of that group should be; we were overwhelmed by the magnitude of the evaluation we already proposed and we considered our plans sufficient for "formative" purposes. We ultimately decided upon three data-gathering tools: The University Seminar

Student Information Form (a survey questionnaire), a Weekly Report, and a Summary Report. Each of these is described below in summary form.

Student Information Form and Form A

Two survey questionnaires were designed by the evaluation committee: the University Seminar Student Information Form and Student Information Form A. Both questionnaires were administered by the mentor teams. The first was administered by mentors on the first day of class and Form A was administered by mentors during either the last day of class or the scheduled final exam time. Approximately 75% of the items on the first questionnaire were repeated on Form A, but Form A asked additional questions of students, specifically focused on their ratings of the Seminar and the knowledge they gained. Each of the questionnaires went through several drafts before it was finalized. The first questionnaire was completed in approximately 30 minutes by students, while Form A took somewhat longer, 35-40 minutes. The questionnaires were coded by the University Division of General Studies staff and keypunched onto IBM cards. Although each section could be identified separately none of our analyses have done so. Copies of both questionnaires are included as Appendix C and D.

In every case possible, an attempt was made to quantify the questionnaire data and, in general, to use multiple-choice questions or scales that had been utilized on similar instruments. However, we did use short essay questions to assess Academic Plans, The Characteristics of an Educated Person, and the Student-University Relationship. In one other instance, the scale of Educational Autonomy, we used an index developed by one of the committee members (Burke) previous

to the Seminar evaluation. Our general impression is that both questionnaires, for the most part, are straightforward but still experimental. Because of this, we attempt to describe the results in as literal a fashion as possible without undue generalization.

Weekly Report

In order to track the development of the individual Seminars, we asked each mentor team to turn in a weekly report to the University Division in order "to facilitate the growth and development of the Seminar Program." Each mentor team was given a packet of 10 forms, one to be submitted every week. In the case where a report was not received, a reminder note was sent to the mentor team approximately one week after the report was due. In some cases the report was always submitted by the same mentor, in other cases the responsibility for turning in the report rotated. Each report was catalogued and made available to all mentor teams during the quarter. While the data gathered were intended to present a picture of the Seminar on an everyday basis, the collection of reports remains a useful way for future mentors to gain from the experience of others.

The weekly report form used is included in Appendix E; it asked four basic questions:

I. What topics were covered during this session?

II. What procedures or methods were used (lectures, discussion, role playing, guest speaker, film, etc.)?

III. Did any problems occur (or do any exist) of which the seminar committee should be aware?

IV. Did any procedure seem unusually effective or worthwhile? Please describe.

Summary Report

Besides the survey questionnaires and the weekly reports, we used one other method to collect data. We asked each mentor team to submit a summary report of the Seminar. The guidelines for the summary report asked specifically that the report not repeat what we already had gotten from the weekly reports, but transmit the mentors' "version of how the weeks added up."

While the complete guidelines are available in Appendix F, the nature of the summary report can be characterized by the introductory paragraph:

> While we have information on student perceptions of the Seminar, and your weekly reports, and that is all very useful, our last request strives to gain from you a more synthetic, integrated image of what the University Seminar was all about. Rather than repeating the type of information you've sent us on a week by week basis (topics, methods, problems, etc.) we would like you to be, for the great part, reflective and critical of the University Seminar while discussing its basic strengths and weaknesses.

In sum, the general procedure we followed in the evaluation was to profile the Seminar students both before and after the Seminar through the use of survey questionnaires developed specifically for the Seminar. At the same time, descriptions of what occurred in the Seminar were gained from weekly and summary reports submitted by the mentor teams. While we had originally intended even more information to be gathered through a sample of student interviews and student projects, we were unable to do so. We have judged the methods we have used to be adequate, but have also taken pains in the report to point out what procedure and methods were problematic and what qualifications should be imposed on the resultant data.

Section III

A PROFILE OF THE STUDENTS AND THE SEMINAR

This section is devoted to profiling some major characteristics of the students who took the Seminar, what their expectations were for the Seminar and data on potential university-wide impact of the Seminar on enrollment patterns. Also, the Seminar is described from the perspective gained from the mentor weekly reports. While all of this can be viewed as preliminary data to the "main events," it is data critical to understanding why students took the Seminar and what the Seminar was, in plain language.

WHICH STUDENTS TOOK THE UNIVERSITY SEMINAR?

The data show that the 425 students who completed the Student Information Form were not distributed equally across sex, college, or residence.* Sixty-seven percent of the students were women; 33% were men. The great majority of the students, as expected, resided in the university residence halls (94%) and were eighteen years of age (84%). The colleges they represented are reported below with comparative figures for the actual distribution of freshmen at BGSU for Fall, 1975.

COLLEGE	STUDENTS IN SEMINAR	FRESHMEN DISTRIBUTION
Arts & Sciences	41.2%	34%
Education	21.9%	25%
Business Administration	19.3%	30%
Health & Community Services	17.4%	8%
Musical Arts	.2%	3%

It is apparent that the College of Arts and Sciences had the greatest percentage of students in the Seminar; 41% of the Seminar students were from

*Due to the number of drop-adds, etc., we were unable always to be certain of the number of students in the Seminar. Our estimate, based on class rosters is that 443 students actually enrolled in the Seminar, and 437 students were in it at the end of the quarter.

Arts and Sciences. This figure was nearly twice the number of students from the college with the second highest percentage (Education). While 17% of the students were from the College of Health and Community Services, that figure was more than double the actual proportion of the Health and Community Services students within the freshman class.

Most seminar students (73%) indicated that they had already decided upon a major; 27% responded that they were "undecided." The majority of the seminar students (87%) reported that they had a particular career in mind, even though 33% of that group indicated that it was only tentative. Thirteen percent of the seminar students reported that they did not have even a tentative career or occupation in mind.

WHY DID STUDENTS ENROLL IN THE UNIVERSITY SEMINAR?

When one considers that the University Seminar had never been offered before at BGSU, it is amazing that nearly 450 students enrolled in the course for Fall, 1975. The first item on the Student Information Form posed seven different reasons why students might have enrolled in the Seminar, and asked the students to check the reason which was <u>most true</u> regarding why they decided to enroll in the Seminar. These reasons are rank-ordered in Table 1.

It is clear from the student reports that the advisor students talked with at Summer Pre-registration was the dominant reason the Seminar had such a large enrollment; 40% of the students reported that the advisor "convinced" them they should enroll in the Seminar. The role of the students' parents was the second reason reported <u>most true</u> in this regard (14%). Apparently, 11% of the students chose the Seminar mostly for pragmatic reasons by checking "two hours of credit would easily fit into my schedule." In

general, it seems the large enrollment was due to someone (advisor, parent, etc.) convincing or encouraging the student to enroll in the Seminar; only 12% of the students indicated that they convinced themselves, without the aid of others, that it would be worthwhile to enroll in the Seminar.

Table 1: Reasons for Enrolling in Seminar (N=425)

Rank	Reason	Percentage
1	The advisor I talked with at Summer Pre-registration convinced me.	40.2
2	My parents brought the Seminar to my attention and encouraged me to enroll.	13.6
3.	My own reading of the material describing the Seminar convinced me.	12.5
4	I thought a course with two hours of credit would easily fit into my schedule.	10.6
5	Someone else besides the advisor at Summer Pre-registration convinced me.	10.1
6	The people who direct my program of study strongly encouraged me to enroll.	5.9
7	I really can't say how I got enrolled in the Seminar.	5.2

WHAT DID STUDENTS EXPECT OF THE SEMINAR?

Since the course had yet to be offered, there was little information that students could depend upon to describe accurately what the course would be like. While phrases such as an "orientation" or "introduction" to the university were used loosely, what those terms meant in practical terms

for the students was unclear. If the students' expectations were considerably different from what the designers of the program meant the course to be and yet still different from the mentors' objectives for the course, trouble was surely on the horizon. Such "built-in" conflicts would result in student dissatisfactions with the course.

Therefore, we generated a series of twenty possible phrases the students might use to describe their expectations of the course. The students were asked to check the three most descriptive phrases which reflected their expectations from the list of twenty. All of the responses were tabulated and then rank-ordered in order to gain a picture of what the student expected from the course. These are reported in Table 2.

The expectation cited by most students (59%) was "to learn what the university has to offer." Expectations ranked second and third by the students were "to learn how the university works" and "to get information about services on campus" (41% and 35%, respectively). Of all the expectations, the three which were cited most frequently were probably the most "global," an indication that students were still unsure of what they could expect, except in the most general of terms. Relatively few students chose to select the phrases "to discuss the purpose of going to college" (7%) and "an opportunity to ask questions" (13%) which were major objectives of the Seminar Program. A very small percentage (.5%) of the students expected to get "to know a professor."

Moderate numbers of students indicated they expected the Seminar to provide opportunities for personal planning and decision-making. Forty-two percent (total of ranks 7, 10, 12, 15) indicated they expected to either plan or make decisions about their college program, goals and objectives, majors, and careers in the Seminar.

Table 2: Student Expectations for the Seminar (N=425)

Rank	Expectation	Percentage*
1	To learn what the university has to offer	59.0
2	To learn how the university works	41.4
3	To get information about services on campus	35.5
4	To get advice on "how to survive in the university"	16.5
5	To ease my transition into college	16.0
6	Meeting other students	15.8
7	To decide on some goals and objectives for myself	14.6
8	To understand how I "fit in" the university	13.2
9	An opportunity to ask questions	12.9
10	To help in making decisions about a career	11.8
11	To learn about extracurricular activities	9.4
12	To help in making decisions about a major	9.2
13	To learn about academic options like credit by exam, off-campus study, etc.	8.9
14	To discuss the purpose of "going to college"	7.0
15	To plan my college program	5.7
16	To receive two more credits	5.4
16	A small classroom setting	5.4
18	Involvement in a new program	2.8
19	To learn about "group requirements"	2.6
20	Getting to know a professor	.5

* Each student was asked to indicate three expectations; therefore, the percentages do not total 100.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE IMPACT OF THE SEMINAR ON STUDENT ENROLLMENT PATTERNS

One of the concerns of the committee was to understand what impact the Seminar (a two-credit course) would have on other course enrollments at the university. Would it simply be an add-on course? Would it displace other "typical" freshman courses? (The committee made no assumption that the course might ultimately displace some other course in the students' academic program.) For this purpose, the committee requested the aid of Computational Services in examining the credit-load of University Seminar students and two comparison groups of students. These three groups were designated Group A (the Seminar students) and Group B and Group C. A description of the three groups follows.

Group A

This group consisted of all students with freshman standing enrolled in University Division 121 (University Seminar) during Fall Quarter, 1975. These students were distributed over colleges as follows: Arts and Sciences (170), Business Administration (70), Education (95), Health & Community Services (90). Total = 425 freshmen.

Group B

Group B consisted of 425 freshmen from Fall Quarter, 1975 who were not enrolled in the University Seminar. The total number in each college was the same as for Group A, but otherwise they were randomly chosen.

Group C

This was a group similar to Group B except that they were chosen from the Fall Quarter, 1974. Again, distribution over colleges was the same.

Before going on to the data, it should be noted that the credit hours generated by the University Seminar reverted back to the department of the faculty member of the mentor team. This fact should, therefore, be integrated into any conclusion about which departments "lost" or "gained" in terms of SCHs as a result of the Seminar. The committee did not do the following analysis in order to determine the validity of those

types of assertions. A list of faculty with department affiliation is included in Appendix B.

The data reported in Table 3 show that the Seminar students (Group A) took, on the average, about one-half a credit more than did students not taking the Seminar in 1975 (Group B), and about one-quarter a credit more than did students in 1974. Of course, the 1974 random sample and 1975 random sample are not comparable. The 1975 sample was drawn after the Seminar students were excluded; the 1974 sample was drawn when there was no University Seminar. The smaller difference between Group A and C (one-quarter credit) may be due to the type of Seminar student likely to take a heavier credit load remaining in the 1974 population.

The most "typical" credit-load for a Seminar student (Group A) was 16 credits (N=175) while for both Group B and C the "typical" credit-load was 15 credits (N=118 and 127, respectively). The average number of courses per student was 4.92 for Group A, while it was 4.23 and 4.27 for Group B and C, respectively. As expected, the deluge of two-credit courses resulted in a lower average number of credit hours per course for Group A (3.17), while Group B and Group C were nearly the same on this measure (3.56 and 3.58, respectively). Tables which illustrate the above data in detail are included in Appendix G.

In sum, the data show that Seminar students took slightly higher credit loads than the other two groups of students. The "typical" seminar student took 16 hours as opposed to 15 hours. In comparison, the Seminar students also took more courses, and had fewer credit hours per course.

A comparison of the three groups was also made of their academic ability according to ACT scores and high school decile and is reported in Table 4. The Seminar students (Group A) had a lower ACT Composite score (20.4) than did the 1974 students (21.1), but were similar to the other 1975 students (20.5).

Table 3: Enrollment Patterns for Three Groups of Freshmen by Student Credit Hours (SCH)

Department	Group A 425 Freshmen in UD 121	Group B 425 Freshmen not in UD 121	Group C 425 Freshmen Fall 1974
UD	977	40	60 (MAP)
ENG	864	871	977*
MATH	697	671	933
BIOL	535	483	615
SOC	412	404	408
SPCH	372	242	390
PSYC	295	520	402*
CHEM	275	420	364*
HPE	250	320	190
HIST	224	228	236*
PER	199	123	46#
PHIL	156	156	152
POLS	156	144	96#
ART	149	239	201*
GEOG	108	174	167*
GEOL	88	132	132*
JOUR	80	48	21#
CS	77	97	73
SOWK	72	16	0#
SPAN	70	110	40
FREN	64	71	72
THEA	64	35	0
HOEC	62	103	152*
BUSE	59	60	73
A&S	53	60	15
PE	0	0	275
GERM	44	54	40
BA	40	48	56*
PAUD	24	10	0
ACCT	0	36	32
RCOM	17	24	0
STAT	4	40	28*
EXPR	13	23	12
ECON	0	64	40*
PHYS	16	51	23*
POPC	0	60	12*
IET	8	83	34*
MISC	95	143	120*
Total Sch.	6619	6407	6487
Ave. Ch. Load	15.57	15.08	15.26

*Group A SCH less than both Group B and Group C.

#Group A SCH greater than both Group B and Group C.

In terms of high school decile (high school rank), the mean high school decile for Seminar students was 3.29 (1=high; 10=low); the mean for Group B was 3.20 and for Group C the mean was 3.07. On both general measures of academic ability (ACT Composite and high school decile), then, Seminar students were slightly lower than their 1975 counterparts and both groups were lower than the 1974 sample.

Table 4: Comparisons on ACT Scores and High School Decile

		Group A 1975	Group B 1975	Group C 1974
MEAN ACT SCORE	English	19.57	19.06*	19.91*
	Math	19.60	20.27*	20.98*
	Social Science	19.53	19.48	20.42*
	Natural Science	22.22	22.37	22.52
	Composite	20.36	20.48	21.09*
MEAN HIGH SCHOOL DECILE		3.29	3.20	3.07

*Note: A difference of 0.70 should be significant at the 0.975 level. A difference of 0.36 is significant at the 0.85 level.

THE SEMINAR: WEEK BY WEEK*

As discussed in the introduction, we felt it was necessary for us to describe the dynamic of the Seminar as well as some of the results of the Seminar. While the committee had the advantage (or the disadvantage, depending upon one's point of view regarding observer bias) of two of its members

*We are indebted to Gloria Jones, a graduate student in College Student Personnel, for her analysis of the weekly report data, and for an early draft of this section of the report.

(Litwin and Burke) being mentors in the programs, it was decided the most systematic way to profile the Seminar was to use the weekly reports.

In some instances it was difficult to interpret mentor comments due to lack of clarity, or the assumption that an evaluator could "read between the lines." Some mentors gave detailed and specific comments while others were vague and too brief to offer much in the way of communicating what actually took place in a particular class session.

Since 25 sections of the University Seminar met for each of the ten weeks, it would have been possible to accumulate a total of 250 weekly reports. 219 reports were eventually turned in; all of the reports were used in compiling lists of topics, methods, problems and effective techniques described by the mentor leaders. By collating summary sheets for each question on the weekly report, it was possible to determine in summary fashion what was occurring in the Seminar.

WHAT TOPICS WERE DISCUSSED IN THE SEMINAR?

The discussion topics relayed in the weekly reports generally fell into one of two broad headings: "philosophical" or "practical." The following general topics were presented in most sections of the Seminar at some time during the ten weeks; the titles themselves should be considered representative:

Philosophical Topics

Why go to college?
What is an educated person?
Life-long learning
Education versus "training"
Values of higher education
What is general education?
Academic honesty
Student participation in the learning process

Practical Topics

Schedule-building
How to use the library
Making career decisions
Grading
Administrative procedures
Study skills and test-taking
University support services
Organization of the University
Fee Allocations
Food Services
Recreational & cultural offerings of BGSU
Residence Hall concerns
Pre-Registration experiences

Overall, approximately 25% of the discussion topics in the Seminar were judged to be more philosophical in nature and 75% were more practical. During the first five weeks of the Seminar the two broad categories were covered about equally, but throughout the last five weeks discussions about practical matters usually carried the day.

WHAT WAS THE FORMAT OF THE SEMINAR?

In an attempt to make the Seminar effective and to maintain student interest and participation, a wide variety of methods were used in presenting the above topics. The most commonly used methods were total class discussion and small group discussion. Small group discussion usually consisted of dividing the class into groups of 4 or 5 students. In approximately 90% of the weekly sessions, one or the other of these methods was used.

Lectures, role-playing, films, videotapes, panel discussions and student reports were also used extensively throughout the Seminar. Films used in two sections were Eve of the Beholder and Future Shock. The videotapes "The Library and How" and "Who Runs the University?" were presented in nearly 50% of the sections. Student reports usually consisted of pairs of students reporting to the Seminar class the results of their visits to

various support services on campus such as Financial Aids, Placement, and Student Activities. During these visits, students generally interviewed staff about the functions and concerns of their respective offices.

Resource persons were used in all of the sections frequently. Most often, the resource person conducted question and answer sessions, used a workshop format, or gave short presentations regarding the wide variety of campus services they represented. A total of 53 resource people were used throughout the 10 weeks with a ratio of 5 per section. Many resource persons were used in more than one section. Resource persons used included members of the faculty and staff such as Dr. Hollis Moore, President; Linda Ogden, Director of Greek Life; Richard Lenhart, Director of Student Activities; Hazel Smith, Director of Commuter Center; Dr. Robert Bashore, Professor of English; and Dr. Thomas Hern, Associate Professor of Mathematics.

WHAT WERE THE PROBLEMS IN THE SEMINAR?

A majority of the problems mentioned by the mentor reporters concerned misconceptions by students. Many students were apparently surprised by the notion that they were to discuss "the purposes of going to college"; some students also resisted the idea of reading and writing required by Seminar sections. Students often felt that the course description had been inaccurate; they were not prepared for course requirements which included turning in 3 small papers or one ten-page term paper. Students also seemed unaware that the Seminar (like other courses) carried the S/U grading option. (Many of the mentor group leaders suggested that in the future only the S/U grade be used.) Many students expected a formal class situation and did not readily accept efforts to create a relaxed, informal setting.

Another recurring problem cited by some mentors was lack of student

participation and enthusiasm. Many students were impatient with the vagueness and irrelevance of some topics, especially the philosophical discussions which seemed far removed from them. They also had difficulty dealing with independent projects and needed considerable guidance from the mentors.

WHAT WERE EFFECTIVE TECHNIQUES USED IN THE SEMINAR?

The technique mentioned by mentors most often as being effective was small group discussion which encouraged much individual participation in groups of four or five students. Games or exercises which facilitated interaction also helped in prepping students for discussion. Team assignments to explore and report on the functions of various University offices were well-received. The films and videotapes used promoted good class discussion.

Of all the various techniques used, guest speakers (resource persons), however, were the most popular with the students. Students felt they were able to ask pertinent questions and gain valuable information from faculty and support staff. For example, the President's visits were "stimulating and increased student understanding of University structure and programs"; Dr. Nancy Wygant and Dr. Joseph Lombardi of the Personal Development and Life Planning Center were recommended highly (Dr. Wygant gave a workshop presentation on career planning); Richard Lenhart of Student Activities gave a presentation on cultural and recreational opportunities at the University.

THE WEEKLY REPORTS, IN SUM

Overall, the topics most "appreciated" by students were those that answered specific questions under the broad category of practical topics. Apparently, both the mentor teams and students worked effectively in small

groups and benefitted from the wide use of interesting and informative resource persons. Problems revolved around incongruent student expectations and limited student participation in some sections, but the overall effectiveness of certain techniques, the variety and number of topics presented and the diverse format of the sessions seemed to overshadow these difficulties.

It was obvious that by using small group discussion, films, and resource persons, classes could be interesting, effective, and promote worthwhile discussion, according to the mentors. The weekly reports most often reflected enthusiasm and involvement on the part of mentor teams and students alike.

Section IV

IMPACT ON STUDENTS

What was the impact of the University Seminar on students? That is perhaps the most difficult question we faced in the evaluation. From the beginning we knew it could not be answered precisely. Studies on college impact have shown the need to control for many factors including selection before valid answers can be put forth regarding impact.* Even those studies on college effect which have controlled on critical factors have usually examined the impact of one full year or even four college years. Admittedly, for us to suggest the outcomes of one two-credit course (10 meetings) which consumed only a small share of a student's agenda during a usually turbulent first quarter on campus was ambitious. At best, we reduced the problem by narrowing the number of outcomes considered to those we could relate directly to the Seminar's basic objectives. Even then, what did happen could not be inferred directly as caused by the Seminar. Other experiences may well have dictated what happened - other courses, other faculty, residence experiences, etc. We assumed that many "outcomes" reflected considerably wider stimuli than just the Seminar. At the same time, factors of self-selection and student maturation must also be considered to have been at work. Except in special cases, then, it may be wiser to conceive of this section in terms of "what changes occurred in students who took the Seminar?". To read the phrase "as a result of the Seminar" into such a question is to neglect a considerable range of variables.

Nevertheless, we did investigate "student outcomes"; our preface to these findings is not meant to negate that, only to suggest caution in

---

*see Feldman, K. and Newcomb, T. The Impact of College on Students San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

interpreting them. Three sets of data are reported in this section: 1) student perceptions of outcomes; 2) information and information sources known by the Seminar students at the end of the quarter; and 3) student change on general attitudes, educational autonomy and other Seminar-related concepts.

What Did Students Perceive to be the Outcomes of the Seminar?

On the post-survey, students were asked to indicate what they got out of the Seminar by checking the three most descriptive phrases from a group of 20 items identical to the group of 20 expectations on the first questionnaire. The only change made was one of tense, so that the phrases reflected what they "got out of the Seminar" as opposed to what they expected to receive from the Seminar. This technique provided us with an indication of not only the outcomes, but how those outcomes differed from the students' original expectations. The data are reported in Table 5 as the percentage of students who selected the response as an outcome (each student could select <u>three</u> outcomes in the same way they could select <u>three</u> expectations).

What students said they got out of the Seminar was, first of all, "information about services on campus" (52%). Second, they said they "learned what the university has to offer" (42%). These outcomes contrast markedly from the two at the bottom of the list which generally focused on more specific outcomes: "planned my college program," (1%) and "helped in making decisions about a major," (1%). To a degree, these last two need to be discounted somewhat because of the few students who were undecided about their major (27%). Interpersonal outcomes were also not rated high, such

as "met other students" (20%); "had a small classroom setting" (11%) and "got to know a professor" (5%).

Two outcomes cited directly as purposes of the Seminar were ranked high: 28% of the students said they "had an opportunity to ask questions" and 21% indicated they "discussed the purpose of going to college". In both of these cases the item was ranked higher as an outcome than it was as an expectation. Therefore, it seems these were two outcomes students did not expect to get, but did. As outcomes, the items were ranked 3 and 4; as expectations, the items were ranked 9 and 14, respectively. However, one other outcome listed as a Seminar goal did not fare as well; only 10% of the students listed "learned about academic options" as an outcome (9% listed it as an expectation).

One item which changed rank to a large degree appeared to indicate a more pragmatic, if not cynical, orientation to the course; the item "received two more credits changed from 17th as an expectation (5%) to 5th as an outcome (20%).

Some of the greatest decreases between expectations and outcomes occurred in areas normally associated with traditional orientation courses such as "advice on 'how to survive' in the university," and "eased my transition into college." Also, decreases were recorded in the area of helping to make decisions about career, major and college program.

The general impression that we hold from these data is that students perceived the major outcomes of the Seminar to be information about campus services and knowing how the university works. Two specific Seminar goals regarding "a forum for asking questions" and "discussing the purpose of college" received relatively high ratings as perceived outcomes. On the other hand, student expectations about planning and making decisions did not seem to be met.

Table 5: Outcomes Reported by Students for the Seminar* (Rank-Order) N=364

Rank	Outcome	Percentage
1	Got information about services on campus	52.5
2	Learned what the university has to offer	42.0
3	Had an opportunity to ask questions	27.5
4	Discussed the purpose of "going to college"	21.4
5	Learned how the university works	20.3
5	Received two more credits	20.3
7	Met other students	20.0
8	Learned about extracurricular activities	14.3
9	Had a small classroom setting	11.0
10	Learned about academic options like credit by exam, off-campus study, etc.	10.2
11	Was involved in a new program	9.9
12	Decided on some goals and objectives for myself	9.3
13	Got advice on "how to survive" in the university	8.8
14	Came to understand how I "fit in" the university	7.7
15	Eased my transition into college	6.9
16	Got to know a professor	4.9
17	Helped in making decisions about a career	3.3
18	Learned about "group requirements"	2.5
19	Helped in making decisions about a major	1.4
20	Planned my college program	1.1

* Students were able to select three outcomes.

Somewhat pertinent to the above discussion of outcomes and expectations are student responses to the question: Which of the following is most true regarding how your experiences with the University Seminar compared with your original expectations? Twenty-six percent of the students said "there was more work involved than I thought there would be"; 43% said the Seminar "differed from my original expectations in several ways (including the workload)"; and, 5% said "there was less work involved than I thought there would be." Although the finding that, in general, students found more work required in the Seminar than they expected is amplified later, it is interesting to note here that only one out of four students found the Seminar to be what they expected.

What Information Did the Students Receive in the Seminar?

Since one of the explicit goals of the Seminar was to bring students considerable information on the University, one set of questions was designed to discover to what extent students actually did receive certain information, or if they learned of a source where they could get such information.

Using the Mentor Handbook* as a guide for designating information a student might gain in the Seminar, 25 items were selected to represent information students would probably not have before entering BGSU, but would probably learn in the Seminar (or elsewhere). Students were asked to report to what extent they were "familiar with" the information, and to indicate where they might get such information. They were given 10 possible sources of information ranging from "another student" to "counseling center". If none of the sources were appropriate, students were asked to

*The Mentor Handbook was prepared for the Seminar by Duane Whitmire of the University Division staff.

write in whatever source they would go to in order to gain such information. The Committee was not as interested in the correctness of the information source as it was in discerning if a student knew of someplace to start the search for such information. Therefore, answers were coded as a "known source" if the students indicated someplace they could go for the information. The findings are reported in Table 6.

The data show that information students were most familiar with (in descending order) were S-U Grade Option, Registration, Grade Point Average, Group Requirements, and Drop-Add Procedures. They were least familiar with (in ascending order) Faculty Senate, CLEP Tests, Academic Freedom, Time-Flexible Degree, and Programs of Study Abroad.

In general, there was a large degree of correspondence between what students were familiar with and knowing a source for getting information; 80% or more of the students knew where to get information on those 5 items they were most familiar with. The corresponding range for items they were least familiar with, however departed from this pattern. On some items with which students were unfamiliar (e.g., Faculty Senate), they also did not know where to go for information (45%); on the other hand, on some other items with which they were unfamiliar (e.g., Programs of Study Abroad), they were knowledgeable about an information source (74%).

The difference between what students were familiar with and what they were not is fairly discernible. They seemed more familiar with those "mechanical" procedures they needed to get along in the university, and they were less familiar with academic options and university governance concepts. Before drawing conclusions, though, one should consider that these findings in the absence of a comparison group of students are open to misinterpretation. How familiar are other students with options such as CLEP and the Time-

Table 6: Information and Sources of Information Known by Students (Percentages). N=364

Item	Extent Known			Mean(Rank)*	Source Known**
	Not at All	To Some Extent	To a Major Extent		
S-U Grade Option	1	47	52	2.52 (1)	89
Financial Aid	28	54	17	1.89 (11)	80
Programs of Study Abroad	59	33	7	1.47 (21)	74
Drop-Add Procedures	8	55	37	2.29 (5)	86
Grade Point Average	9	49	41	2.32 (3)	85
Board of Trustees	56	38	6	1.50 (20)	53
CLEP Test (College Level Exam Program)	71	23	5	1.34 (24)	57
Career Placement	35	51	14	1.79 (13)	78
Periodicals	17	47	36	2.20 (6)	88
Time-Flexible Degree	65	26	7	1.42 (22)	54
LINK	43	41	15	1.72 (17)	64
Group Requirements	7	56	36	2.30 (4)	85
Reserve Books	20	47	32	2.12 (10)	85
Academic Probation	35	54	10	1.76 (15)	74
Mark of I (Incomplete)	34	53	13	1.78 (14)	74
Independent Study	47	45	7	1.60 (19)	68
Registration	5	56	39	2.34 (2)	80
General Education	28	60	10	1.82 (12)	67
Little College	46	42	11	1.65 (18)	65
Prerequisites	12	59	28	2.17 (8)	77
Faculty Senate	76	20	3	1.25 (25)	45
Cluster Colleges	37	51	11	1.74 (16)	69
Academic Freedom	59	35	4	1.44 (23)	48
General Fees	11	61	28	2.17 (8)	76
Graduation Requirements	7	65	27	2.20 (6)	85

*(1=Not at All; 3 = To a Major Extent)

**Percentage of students who indicated a source where they could go for information related to the item.

Flexible Degree? We suspect other students know even less about these options. However, we also suspect that what the Seminar students were most familiar with were those things they would have learned of without the Seminar. Some support for this assertion exists when you consider that "learned about group requirements" was rated as a Seminar "outcome" by only 3% of the Seminar students, yet 93% of the students in the Seminar either were familiar with group requirements "to some" or to a "major extent." If the Seminar made a difference, it probably did so in the areas students would normally be less familiar with at the end of Fall quarter.

In What Ways Did Students Change?

In order to measure student change we administered the same set of items to students both before and after the Seminar. Some of these constructs - Academic Plans, Educated Person, Relationship to the University, and Educational Autonomy - were most important to the Seminar than others: general attitudes of students. While these latter items were not viewed as critical to assessing the Seminar along strict goal-oriented lines, they did provide a check on "unanticipated" outcomes and profiled the general orientation of the student. For the purpose of looking at change, we eliminated students from the sample for whom we did not have <u>both</u> pre and post-tests. This reduced our "change" sample to 308 students.

1. General Attitudes

The results of the four general attitude questions are reported in Table 7. The findings seem rather straightforward. First, we wanted to learn how important grades were to the students and a question designed for that purpose allowed students to check one of four positions from "little or no importance" to "more important than anything because your future depends on it". There is no doubt that

students felt grades were important: more than 95 percent checked the two highest positions -- "important" or "more important than anything else" both before and after the quarter. The small change that occurred during the quarter was slight but away from seeing grades as "more important than anything else," to "important with other things equally important."

Two questions were used to determine the extent to which students valued learning experiences structured by others. The first question was the more general and asked students to choose between agreement with the idea of an existing body of knowledge to be imposed through requirements or the idea of student-directed learning. Clearly, more students felt both before and after the quarter that the idea of student freedom and direction was preferable to structured requirements. A small change, however, could be seen after the quarter toward agreement with the idea of requirements and prerequisites (from 33% to 39%).

A second question aimed at the concept of control asked students to express preference for a class with "clear requirements and little student independence" or for a class with "vague requirements and greater student independence." This time students overwhelmingly chose the former. Again, this was evident at both testings. A small end-of-quarter change was toward preference for the class with clear expectations (73% to 78%). Apparently, although students wanted greater freedom in choosing their curriculum (above question) they became slightly more tolerant of faculty direction and some increased in their preference for instructor control within classes.

Another general question concerned the degree to which students thought about themselves -- their values and goals, their sense of identity. We asked them at both testings how much they thought about

Table 7

General Attitude Expression
Pre Quarter and Post Quarter

	Pre Quarter	Post Quarter
A. Importance Attached to Grades		
Little or none	.6	.6
Important, but less than other things	.6	2.3
Important as other things	58.4	64.0
More important than anything	37.3	31.8
B. Identity Formation "How much have you thought about the questions, 'Who am I? What do I want? What will I become?'"		
A great deal	20.5	17.5
Frequently	61.4	66.9
Rarely	14.6	14.6
Not at all	1.9	1.0
C. Value for Structure and Requirements "Which of the following statements comes closer to your views?"		
Faculty should direct student's course of study through required courses, prerequisites, etc.	32.8	38.6
Students should be given freedom in choosing subjects and courses of study.	63.3	59.1
"Which of the following two types of classes do you prefer?"		
A class that stresses student independence even though assignments may be vague.	23.4	20.5
A class that stresses clear requirements but restricting student independence.	72.7	77.6

these things. They could check one of four positions from "not at all" to "a great deal." Even before the quarter began it was evident that the great majority, 82 percent, thought about these things either "frequently" or "a great deal." A small change occurred after the quarter away from the highest position (a great deal") toward the next highest ("frequently").

In sum, we found only slight changes among students in their general position on these four questions. Both before and after, students saw grades as important, preferred the notion of student freedom and direction in class choices, yet preferred "clear requirements" within a class, and often thought about their own sense of identity (what was important to them).

2. Educational Autonomy

An experimental scale of "Educational Autonomy" was administered in an attempt to measure the degree to which students were personally motivated in their learning. Students who might be called educationally autonomous would see themselves as responsible for learning; an educationally dependent student would view the institution and teachers as responsible for his/her education.

Out of 16 items on this scale, only 3 were found to be significantly different from pre to post testing. In each of these 3 cases the direction of change was toward less educational autonomy. For example, students agreed more at the end of the quarter that achievement differences are due to student ability to "play the game." Similarly they agreed more at the end of quarter that a poor class is the fault of the instructor. The responses and the direction of these changes taken together indicate a

confirmation of the general changes described in the previous set of questions: students, after the quarter, seemed less interested in student direction and more interested in teacher direction. This may be explained as a socialization phenomenon or it may be a tempering of idealistic notions. For instance, 95% of students before the quarter felt they could "have more control if they showed greater initiative." An end of quarter decrease (to 91.6%) may represent the only realistic change one could expect. These results are reported in Table 8.

3. Academic Plans

Since one purpose of the seminar was to aid students in developing academic plans, a question was specifically designed to measure changes occurring in the nature of these plans. The committee decided that this would be an open-ended essay response to be rated by judges along two dimensions -- Articulation (clarity) and Inclusiveness (narrow-broad, vocational-personal). We wanted to know if students became clearer in their goal specifications and broader in their outlook.

Pre and post quarter responses generated by a random sample of 50 students from the seminar were read by four judges. Each judge read 25 pre-quarter essays and 25 post-quarter essays from the same students. Each subject's essays were read and evaluated independently by two judges. No judge was able to detect whether a response was a pre-quarter response or a post-quarter response. Statistical correlations between judges were moderately positive. For purposes of describing their evaluation, the ratings of judges reading the same papers were averaged. (See appendix H for a copy of the rating form and definition of terms).

Table 8

Expressions of Educational Autonomy Pre Quarter and Post Quarter in Percentages

	Pre Quarter Agreement	Post Quarter Agreement
Students who do well in school are different mostly in their ability to "play the game."	40.0	50.3
The better students in school probably have greater academic ability than the students who do poorly.	28.9	32.1
Students could hold class sessions even with professors absent.	52.6	45.8
It matters little to me whether my professors hold Ph.Ds.	67.5	66.5
A poor class experience can usually be attributed to the instructor's lack of ability.	33.3	47.0
Students have as much responsibility for a good class experience as teachers.	94.8	89.6
Many of the troubles students experience are a result of bad luck.	13.6	13.6
It doesn't much matter what I do in most courses - it comes out the same way.	3.2	4.2
Students could have more control over their school experience if they expressed greater initiative.	95.4	91.6
The open-door policy of many colleges waters down the educational experience for most students.	35.4	35.4
I don't understand why colleges are run the way they are.	24.3	24.4

Table 8 (continued)

	Pre Quarter Agreement	Post Quarter Agreement
I will be glad when my education is completed.	59.7	62.3
I do my best in school because a lot of people would be let down if I failed.	57.8	64.3
Tests measure real learning.	11.0	12.3
My feelings about the instructor have little to do with my ability to study a subject.	29.9	21.8
I am not sure why I came to college.	14.3	16.3
Small group discussions in class are little more than shared ignorance.	8.5	10.4

Table 9 represents the judges' evaluation of responses to the question on academic plans in terms of percentages along the dimensions of Articulation and Inclusiveness. The average of judges' ratings indicated that slightly more post-quarter essays were judged to be "articulate" (clearer), and that plans changed slightly toward the less inclusive (vocational-short range) responses. These differences, however, are very slight; for example, 45% of the students at the beginning of the quarter articulated their academic plans clearly; 51% did so at the end of the quarter.

4. Educated Person

Another function of the seminar was to discuss with students the concept of an educated person. Consequently, an open-ended question on the pre-quarter and post-quarter evaluations asked students to express their definition of an educated person. In the manner described above for academic plans, the responses to these questions were analyzed by judges along three dimensions -- Achievements versus Attributes, Learned versus Learning, and Vocational versus Personal.

Table 10 represents the results of the judges' evaluation of responses to this question. Generally, as with the question on academic plans, the changes found in the judges' evaluation of post-quarter responses as compared to pre-quarter responses were in the direction suggested by the objectives of the seminar. The judges found more post-quarter definitions to include a basic emphasis on attributes and skills of the educated person (e.g., continually learning) as opposed to end-state achievements (e.g., has Ph.D.) than they found on the pre-quarter essays. Correspondingly, there was a drop in the number of essays stressing end-state achievements as crucial criteria for defining

Table 9

Articulation and Inclusiveness of Academic Plans Pre to Post Quarter in Percentages*

	Pre Quarter	Post Quarter
Articulated Clearly	45	51
Not Articulated, Vague	50	44
Vocational, Short Range	63	65
Personal, Long Range	30	26

*Figures represent the average percent of responses falling into categories as interpreted by two raters for each subject. Figures do not add up to 100% for each dimension because some responses did not apply or were clearly intermediate on the scale used.

an educated person.

Those results correspond with judges' ratings along the second dimension used for analysis. More post-quarter essays were judged to be oriented toward the "learning-doing" criterion as opposed to the "learned-credentialed" criterion. Finally, using the third dimension to analyze these responses, there was an increase in the number of essays with definitions judged to include a personal perspective as opposed to a vocational perspective. Again, it must be said that the differences along these three dimensions are small from pre-quarter to post-quarter. They are at least all in a similar direction of change -- toward a definition of the educated person which is more dynamic and generic and less credentialed and vocational.

5. University Relationship

One question appearing on the evaluation forms was designed to detect differences in the way students perceived their relationships to the university. Since the question suggested certain terms for possible relationships, students most often simply wrote which of these terms applied. Consequently, in the analysis, judges simply tallied which terms were used by students on pre-quarter and post-quarter questionnaires to describe their relationship to the university. The terms used were: Learner, Explorer, Seeker, Paying Customer, Number, Member of Community, and Trainee. The data are reported in Table 11.

The inspection of pre-quarter and post-quarter essays found that students listed more of these terms after the quarter than before, suggesting that they found their relationship to the institution more complex after a quarter of study. The terms most frequently checked

Table 10

Interpretations of Student Definitions of "The Educated Person" in Percentages of Pre and Post Quarter Responses*

	Pre Quarter	Post Quarter
End - State, Achievements	9	3
Skills and Attributes	81	90
Learned, Credentialed	31	14
Learning (Doing - Active)	50	60
Vocational, Specific	17	9
Personal, Generic	65	73

*Figures represent the average percent of responses falling into categories as interpreted by two raters for each subject. Figures do not add up to 100% because some responses did not apply or were clearly intermediate on the scale used.

on the first questionnaire -- Learner, Explorer -- were also the most frequently checked on the post-questionnaire. Similarly, the term used least often at pre-quarter--Trainee—was also the least checked at end of quarter. The term which had the largest increase in use at post-quarter was Learner (40 to 61%); the next largest increases, however, were for the terms Paying Customer (12 to 21%) and Number (10 to 21%). It might have been expected that students would see themselves more as members of a community after the quarter of study, but there was only a slight change in the number of students using that term at the end of the quarter (18 to 20%).

On Student Change

The results of our attempt to measure student change through the Seminar must be interpreted with a number of qualifications. First, students at the beginning of a quarter (especially their first quarter) are likely to be optimistic, excited, and ambitious; students at the end of the quarter, however, are likely to be feeling anxious (final examinations, etc.), concerned, and worked-over. This may explain some of the change seen at the end of the quarter toward a greater desire for structure and teacher control. Grades are about to be crystalized during final exam week, and those who experienced loosely-structured courses were likely more anxious about them than they were when the quarter began.

Secondly, since we were unable to use a control group, we have no way of knowing whether our students were effected more or less than students not taking the Seminar. For example, we reported here that students seemed somewhat less educationally autonomous at the end of the quarter than when the quarter began. It may be that other students became even more "dependent"

Table 11

Students' Relationship to the University
Pre and Post Quarter in Percent of Sample
Choosing Representative Terms*

	Pre Quarter	Post Quarter
Learner	40.5	61
Explorer	30	33
Seeker	20	21
Paying Customer	12	21
Number	10	21
Member of Community	18	20
Trainee	6.5	9
Other	29	23

*Figures represent the average percent of responses falling into categories as interpreted by two raters for each subject.

after a quarter of study. We simply cannot know that with the information we had.

In brief, the essay questions we used were of an untried nature; we were pleased with the development of the measures. On the basis of the judges' ratings, the slight changes were generally in favor of the Seminar's objectives - students could articulate their plans more clearly after the seminar than before, and their description of an "educated person" changed. What became disturbing to us was that while students' perceptions of their relationship to the university also changed (usually becoming more complex), the increases in students (twice as many after than before) who saw their relationship as "a number" and "paying customer" may say something about the first quarter experience of the BGSU student. These changes indicate an increasing amount of alienation on the part of the student, a finding that does not seem to speak well for the way students are treated at the University.

Attitudes and personality-related constructs are notoriously difficult to change, yet most changes in students were in the direction the Seminar goals posited as important even though it cannot be stated that the Seminar caused these changes. As the program matures, a more systematic and effective curriculum and methodology may enhance positive student change. Finally, it must be stressed that much of what we attempted to measure may suggest positive or negative change; but whether the freshman experience should best clarify or disturb the student's sense of direction may be an open question. Some would argue that an appropriate freshman experience would disrupt the notions students bring with them to college in order that they be more open to alternatives and have a real chance to view assumptions from

various perspectives. We were assuming that it was better for students to be more articulate in their educational plans, to have a more "open" concept of an educated person, and to be autonomous as learners. These, of course, are the values expressed by the objectives of the program. The ultimate evaluation of the effect of the seminar would be in long-range terms. Will the students be better educated and will they be using the university more to their advantage next year and the year after?

Section V

STUDENT AND MENTOR RATINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY SEMINAR

In this section we have collected the evaluative opinions of students and mentors on various aspects of the University Seminar. This summary collection represents hundreds of person-hours of effort in completing questionnaires and writing reports for which we are grateful to both students and mentors. No summary can do complete justice to the total body of evaluative information and prose collected, but we hope the reader will recognize at least the most prominent patterns in the data.

HOW DID STUDENTS RATE THE SEMINAR?

Students who took the Seminar answered an extensive set of questions intended to evaluate both general and specific aspects of the Seminar. 364 students from 24 of the sections completed the questionnaire during the last week of the quarter. Due to some miscommunication the 25th section had the students complete the questionnaire nearly a month after the other students responded; this group, therefore, was not included in the sample.

1. General Opinions

The first section of the questionnaire asked students to express their general opinions of the Seminar regarding "how it has been taught." Students were asked to indicate their agreement with each item presented using a 4-point scale. The percentages used in the report compare those students who "strongly agree" or "agree" with those who "strongly disagree" or "disagree." The results are reported in Table 12.

One of our major concerns was that the purposes of the Seminar were not clear to students because of the hurried nature of the implementation of the program. To a degree, this did prove to be

a warranted concern. Thirty-seven percent of the students disagreed with the statement that "the purpose and objectives for the Seminar were clear." On the other hand, 62% of the students did agree with the statement which suggests that a large number of the mentor teams were able to convey the purposes and objectives of the Seminar to students. We assume this latter figure to be fairly typical of any course offered for the first time - perhaps it is even high when one considers few mentors had any experiences at all with such a program.

On the issue of relative emphasis, students (86%) disagreed that "the Seminar emphasized practical information too much"; 80% also disagreed that "philosophical information" was emphasized too much. For most students the Seminar, apparently, struck a correct balance in terms of conveying philosophical and practical information. Other findings are summarized below.

- The Seminar format/personnel made students feel free to ask questions or express opinions and think for themselves. (items 4,5)
- While students said they could purse individual interests, a good number apparently didn't put a great deal of effort into the Seminar. (items 7,9)
- Mentors were well-prepared, open to student viewpoints, interested in students, and the mentor "team concept" should be continued. (items 6,8,10,17)
- While 73% of the students agreed that the Seminar was quite useful, only 52% would recommend others take it. (items 13,18)

2. Specific Methods

The second set of evaluative items asked students, in overall terms, to rate specific methods used in the Seminar. A five-point scale from "Excellent" to "Poor" was used as well as the category

Table 12: Student Ratings of the Seminar (Percentages). N=364

Item	Strongly Agree/Agree	Strongly Disagree/Disagree
1. The purpose and objectives for the Seminar were made clear	62	37
2. There was agreement between the announced purpose and objectives of the Seminar and what was actually taught	64	32
3. Class time was used well	69	28
4. Students were encouraged to think for themselves	89	8
5. In the Seminar I felt free to ask questions or express my opinions	88	10
6. The mentors were well-prepared for each class	79	19
7. I put a good deal of effort into the Seminar	60	38
8. The mentors were open to student viewpoints	96	3
9. I had an opportunity to pursue individual interests in the Seminar	75	24
10. The mentors seemed to be interested in students as persons	93	5
11. The Seminar was too philosophical	17	80
12. More courses should be taught this way	64	33
13. I would encourage all new students to BGSU to take the Seminar	52	45
14. The Seminar was informal and personalized	90	9
15. The Seminar emphasized practical information too much	13	86
16. The grading policy for the Seminar was made clear	64	35
17. The Seminar would be better if it were taught by only one instructor	7	91
18. The Seminar, overall, was quite useful	73	25

"Doesn't Apply." Data from this section are reported in Table 13; for purposes of brevity, the data have been grouped under four responses: Excellent-Good, Satisfactory-Fair, Poor, and Doesn't Apply.

On the topic of Seminar readings, only 26% of the students saw the "required books" as "excellent or good." The fact that 34% of the students said this item "doesn't apply" to them was surprising; it was our understanding that students were to read at least two books (or their equivalent) in the Seminar.

Of the instructional techniques used in the Seminar, students, in general, verified the weekly reports. They rated the value of "resource persons" highest (66%) in comparison with class discussions (57%) and student projects (47%). We assume that the value of these resource persons to students was mainly as "information-bearers" and accounts somewhat for the fact that 52% of the students designated "gaining information" as one of three outcomes they perceived from the Seminar.

HOW DID MENTORS SUMMARIZE THE SEMINAR EXPERIENCE?

Toward the end of the quarter we asked each mentor team to submit a summary report on the Seminar which would have two basic parts. The first part would address the basic character and nature of the Seminar in a reflective mode. The second part of the report would be a commentary on the "nuts and bolts" of the Seminar. Fifteen (60%) of the sections submitted such a report, as did two individuals from other sections. Since a reminder was sent to the mentor teams, we assume that the demands of other duties prevented the remaining mentors from completing the reports. The reports submitted ranged from one-page descriptions to more

Table 13: Student Ratings Continued (Percentages)

Item	Excellent/ Good	Satisfactory/ Fair	Poor	Doesn't Apply
1. Overall, I would rate the required books	26	32	8	34
2. Overall, I would rate the supplementary readings	21	34	7	36
3. I would rate the general quality of lectures	49	36	4	11
4. I would rate the overall value of class discussions	57	37	4	1
5. I would rate the overall value of the resource persons (outside speakers)	66	22	2	9
6. I would rate the value of the student project	47	41	7	3
7. I would rate the overall value of this course to me as	50	39	10	1

lengthy works that included copies of Seminar syllabi and complementary readings.

Because the mentor teams gave uneven attention to the summary reports, no "scientific" analysis of the questionnaires has been done; however, they have all been read by each of the evaluation team members. We have summarized our readings in two ways: 1) by highlighting the major issues appearing in the reports across sections, and 2) by arraying representative comments from the reports themselves. The first of these, our interpretation of the major issues, follows.

On Students

Mentors had the general impression that students expected something quite different from the Seminar when they came to it than they

subsequently found. For example, they expected to do less work. Students expected the Seminar to consist mostly of information about BGSU and they expected their role to be primarily passive. Subsequently, the students seemed more responsive to their own expectations than to those of their mentors. A major criticism from mentors was that students were unresponsive, and became excited only when questions of a rather specialized nature were the focus of the class; examples of these topics are drop-add procedures, the question of grades, academic options, counseling services, etc. Most mentors felt that the quality of student projects was not high. This was because students did not expect to be assigned such projects, so they gave little preparation and thought to them.*

THE RELATIONSHIP OF PHILOSOPHICAL TO PRACTICAL ISSUES

Most of the mentor teams felt the course would have been improved had the pragmatic aspects of the course come first and the larger philosophical questions (Why am I here?, What is college all about?, etc.) later. The students, as entering freshmen, had no college experience to relate to the latter questions. They had given little previous thought to philosophical questions so they had no context in which to discuss the issues meaningfully. Some sections adopted the technique of starting from the practical and

*One late addition to our data is interesting to note here. The uneven quality of student work, as reported by the mentors, does not appear to be reflected in the grade distribution for the seminar. Of 437 grades awarded, 25% of the students were assigned an A, 19% were assigned a B, and 43% received Satisfactory; a total of 4% of the students were assigned a D, F, or U. The complete grade distribution is included as Appendix I.

going to the philosophical either within a class session or throughout the Seminar and found this approach more successful.

OUTCOMES

The question of "student outcomes" was not addressed in many of the summary reports; when it was, the suggested outcomes were vague. One mentor team felt that students had dealt perceptively with many of the conflicting and contradictory purposes of going to college; in another section, the mentors expressed confidence that students will make better use of the University because of the Seminar; in a third section, the mentors felt that students' ability to perceive problems was heightened as a result of the seminar experience. A faculty mentor in another section suggested that the major outcome was one of "academic gamesmanship", i.e., getting to know one's way around the university. This same mentor suggested that the larger purpose of helping the student to become a better inquirer or question-asking person was not met.

ON MENTORS THEMSELVES

Perhaps the most consistent complaint in the summary reports was that not enough communication occurred between the Seminar planners and the mentor teams and that very limited planning time was available. Many felt that a workshop for the orientation of the mentors would have been immensely helpful and recommended it strongly for next year. Some of the summary reports implied that the mentor team was not a "team," but three individuals who happened to be thrown together by chance. The time to reconcile differences and to integrate the

seminar was not available. On the other hand, some mentor teams seemed to overcome these difficulties and to be both compatible and unified in approach. These latter teams either agreed about the course objectives a priori, or found that they personally were compatible and worked hard at the task as equals.

LACK OF GUIDANCE

Several mentor teams voiced strong feelings that there was no organizing or driving force for the Seminar. They felt that, outside of the handbook and some encouraging remarks, insufficient direction and guidance was given to the mentor teams. It seems many mentor teams would have appreciated more guidelines on grades, projects, and many other routine matters. This may not have been a strong complaint had the teams themselves had the time to provide the direction and organization for their own classes; but given their individual constraints, it appeared they expected these needs to be filled by others.

In several instances, mentors suggested they were disappointed that the evaluation committee had not been feeding back the results to the teams and had not responded to specific questions on the weekly reports. Several mentor teams felt that too much was required of them in terms of cooperating with evaluation efforts.

In general, the summary reports conveyed the impression that the experience of the mentors was frustrating, due to factors already mentioned such as lack of time and incorrect student expectations, yet quite rewarding because of lively discussion and interaction with students. While many mentors were unsure of what had been accomplished in the Seminar,

they usually asserted that its potential for becoming a useful supplement to the Bowling Green curriculum was moderate to great.

Representative Comments

The following is a tabulation of short quotes or paraphrases from the summary reports, grouped according to similarity of subject. They represent a reasonably complete and representative sample of critical comments from the reports, twelve of which came from identifiable sections of the University Seminar. The column of numbers at right refers to section numbers from which the comments (or reasonably similar ones) came. The emphasis in this compilation is on those comments which are critical or which suggest changes that might improve the Seminar; one should not infer from them that the reports were primarily negative in their evaluation.

Comments on Time, Place and Format.	Section #
Two-hour sessions should be two, one-hour sessions.	5873
Two-hour sessions left students tired.	5794
Daytime meetings preferable.	5892
People at "ebb tide" in early evening.	5880
Class at dinner hour after a working day is bad.	5882
Too many students for effective class.	5880
Informal, comfortable meeting place good.	5794
Conference-type room excellent.	5878
200 Hayes ugly, dreary, filthy, etc.	5880
Place too big, too great an echo.	5886
All sections should meet together at least once a week.	5892
Suggest large group meeting, then small discussion.	

Comments on Materials and Content	
Handbook was a "crutch".	5892
Handbook not used much.	5787
Student mentors should have handbook.	5781, 5882, 5891
Not enough handbook material for 10 classes.	5896
Students didn't do much reading.	5873
Readings not directly relevant.	5889
Readings should be more integrated.	5794
Several books outside interest and ability of students.	5898

	Section #
Should be more "how to" sessions.	5873
(i.e.,how to study, use library, etc.).	5781
Should be emphasis on duties and responsibilites of students (not only on their rights).	5781
More Career Development emphasis.	5896
Should start with specific, everyday, then move to general, philosophic questions.	5794, 5896
Students did not gain abstract thinking skills.	5892
Too much "philosophical diddling".	
Too academically easy.	5892
Should be required with no credit, or optional, with credit and more demanding of the student.	5781
Should have only one credit.	5880, 5896
There were "no significant outcomes."	5886
Resource persons should primarily field questions.	5889
Guest lectures and panel most helpful.	5896
Having student teams visit university offices good.	
Students with letter grades did better than S/U.	5892
Should be S/U for all students.	5880
Important outcomes were in student's ability to perceive problems and integration with university.	5878

Comments on Student Characteristics or Behavior.

Students didn't choose UD 121 but were urged on by parents.	5787
Students didn't expect to work outside class.	5781
Students expected an "easy course".	5882
Students didn't take course seriously.	5886
Same people always contributed	5787
Students were bored many times.	
Kids preferred to sit and listen.	5886
Students cautious in class participation.	
Students reluctant to "jump in".	5898
Students need an "icebreaker".	5880
Students often confused by unclear assignments.	
Students not ready for discussion of higher education.	5896
Students more concerned with specifics.	5889
Students have uneven communication skills.	5891
Students unable to write well.	5898
Students not excited about anything that was not immediate and personal.	5886

Comments on Mentor Reactions and Behavior.

Mentors did not give enough early guidance.	5889
Mentors should have more extensive training.	5794
Mentor coordination takes time and cooperation.	5878

	Section #
Mentors did not prepare well.	5787
One person must assume responsibility.	5892
Mentors disagreed on goals of seminar.	
Students bored because mentors were boring.	
Faculty mentor wouldn't delegate responsibility.	
Mentors should make required assignments.	5892
Too many man-hours, too little renumeration.	5878
Lot of time required for paperwork, planning	5882
Mentors should have more recognition, appreciation.	
Role of student mentor needs "definition".	5896

Some Overall Reactions.

Very positive reaction perceived in the attitudes of students.	5873
Seminar was very valuable and should be continued with two-hours credit.	5873
We thoroughly enjoyed our experience.	5889
Success depends on mentors, not structure.	5889
Academic credit essential because of competition posed by other courses.	5889
Most persistent problem: lack of response from students.	5892
At the outset I was ready to give University Seminar an A and our section a B; now I give University Seminar a B and us a C.	5892
I was not fully satisfied -- not many inquiring minds.	5892
In general, a positive experience.	5794
Recommend continuance as a 2-hour course.	5794
Information should be made available during orientation week and not offered for credit.	5787
I have thoroughly enjoyed working with the class.	5787
University Seminar fulfilled part of its objectives but failed in important ways.	5781
Program should be compulsory with zero credit.	5781
Great utility from a students' view, but resource allocation problems in mentor view.	5878
Exploring issues with freshmen is refreshing and rewarding.	5878
We think only one credit should be given since it is "service to the student" course with few demands on student.	5880
We cannot praise mentor team concept too highly. Rewarding to us and students.	5880
Generally accepted as worthwhile by students, end result - informed freshmen.	5882
Several UD Responsibilities need examining.	5882
If there were significant outcomes, they were shaped for the future but do not yet exist.	5886
An enjoyable and frustrating experience -- I would do it again!	5886
All of us felt positive about the seminar.	5891
Sound concept; should focus wholly on BGSU resources -- other material is academic snobbery.	5896
Many good things did occur, but program must be changed in several respects before it is offered again.	5896
We were reasonably satisfied that most students profited - concept a "fine one".	5898
In terms of its value to us, we urge continuance.	5898

Section VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this last section of the report we have tried to summarize a large set of data collected from diverse sources at different times. Our general philosophy of remaining outcome-oriented, comprehensive, and sensitive to the dynamic of the program has been adhered to, even though at times it became cumbersome and trying to others. After summarizing the major findings of the study and the limitations of the report, this section is devoted to our general conclusions (not always easily arrived at) and our recommendations (more easily arrived at) for the second year of the University Seminar.

Major Findings

1. Student expectations of the Seminar can be characterized as usually "global"; they expected to gain considerable information and a general idea of how the university worked through the Seminar. To a degree, students' expectations differed from those of the Seminar planners in specific ways; for example, students did not expect to spend time discussing "the purposes of going to college." Most important, students had a misperception of the amount of work that would be required of them in the Seminar. In general, they expected less.

2. The large Seminar enrollment (near 450) was primarily due to the encouragement of academic advisors and other college representatives at summer pre-registration.

3. When Seminar students were compared to a randomly selected group of students not taking the Seminar this past fall, Seminar students

took a workload of ½ credit more on the average (16 credits). Overall, Seminar students also took more 3-hour courses and fewer 4 and 5 credit hour courses than did their counterparts. Thus, the Seminar may have had an impact on general enrollment patterns. An alternate interpretation is that the University Seminar enrollment patterns were influenced by other factors, such as changing student interests.

4. The Seminar was primarily a discussion-type class and made liberal use of "resource persons" and outside speakers. Students did not respond adequately to the more "philosophical" aspects of the Seminar due, in large part, to their limited experience with the university setting.

5. Students perceived the major outcome of the Seminar to be the general information they received about campus services and how the university worked. To a moderate degree, they ranked outcomes such as "discussed the purpose of going to college" and "had an opportunity to ask questions" as being attained, and higher than they had designated them as expectations. Outcomes related to decisions about major, career, or academic program were rated low.

6. At the end of the quarter, students tended to be more articulate about their academic plans, to define the characteristics of an "educated person" in a different way, and to be slightly less educationally autonomous than at the beginning of the quarter.

7. At the end of the quarter, a majority of Seminar students were

familiar with items relating to the "mechanics" of student life, while a majority were unfamiliar with items relating to academic options and university governance.

8. Students, overall, gave positive ratings to the Seminar, though not unanimously:
   a. They approved and liked the "mentor" concept.
   b. They could pursue their interests in the class.
   c. Questions and discussion were encouraged.
   d. They thought the philosophical and practical aspects of the Seminar were balanced.
   e. However, they didn't put a great deal of effort into the Seminar.

9. Mentor comments suggested the Seminar realized limited student outcomes primarily because of limited student expectations and effort. Many mentors felt inadequately trained for the Seminar and indicated a desire for more direction.

Limitations

Before stating our general conclusions, we would like to be more explicit about what we consider to be some important limitations of the data and the study.

1. The Experimental Nature of the Instruments. All of the questionnaires and measurements used in the study were developed by the committee; their reliability and validity are unknown. In those areas where the questions are straightforward, e.g., expectations for the Seminar, results are probably more valid than in areas

where items were purported to measure some larger construct. Even in the former questions, student response was limited by the choices designated by the committee.

2. No Comparison Group. Perhaps the greatest limitation was the lack of a comparison group of students. This became a limiting factor most often when we wanted to compare what appeared to be "disquieting" data (e.g., familiarity with academic options) from the Seminar students with data on other groups of students.

3. Imprecise goals and objectives. Often, we were forced to make arbitrary decisions regarding what was meant by a statement in the Seminar proposal (e.g., "humanistic introduction"). Another committee may well have chosen another set of constructs to evaluate.

4. Aggregate analysis. Due to time constraints, we were unable to look at individual Seminar sections. The "aggregate" analysis reported here may hide some outstanding sections as well as some poorer ones. It could have been valuable to look more closely at both ends of the distribution.

5. Attribution of Cause. Overall, the Seminar was only a small part of the incoming freshman's life. We considered little else about them in the analysis such as major, college, etc.; the fact that the Seminar was only one input into a usually hectic and turbulent quarter for the Seminar student needs to be kept in mind. Because of this, neither credit nor blame regarding student outcomes can easily be attributed to the Seminar.

While we consider the above to be general limitations, we do not suggest they negate the information presented in this report; they were usually taken into account when interpretations of the data were made. The limitations, though, are important and the reader should be cognizant of them while putting this report into perspective.

Conclusions

We do not believe that the evaluation of a new educational program can adopt a "win or lose" proposition; there is no agreed-upon standard for complete success or failure. Therefore, we have used this section to draw conclusions in relative terms. In keeping with our earlier stated motif of a "formative" evaluation,we have stayed away from being judgmental in most cases, and have viewed our task akin to "pointing up" the data and issues we think are pertinent. The following conclusions are, of course, inter-connected,but we have treated them separately as an aid to clarity.

Goals of the Seminar

The goals and objectives of the Seminar - humanistic introduction, discussing the purpose of college, etc. - are worthwhile goals and objectives to be pursued with the use of university resources. However, they are stated inadequately, i.e., they are vague and ambiguous. This fact creates at least two problems: 1) they are difficult to evaluate, i.e.,they are often not "measurable", and 2) they do not provide sufficient direction for the mentors. These difficulties are apparent in the arbitrary manner with which constructs were interpreted in this report, and in the mentor reports which often indicated a need for more guidance as well as some student confusion about what the Seminar entailed.

This is not to say one should only attempt to do what is easily "measurable." Many social and mental constructs are difficult, if not impossible, to measure and those are often among those most worth doing. What is needed though is a clear set of indicators of what the Seminar intends to do and what should be happening to students while this is being done.

Mentors

The most clear and strongest set of statements emerging from the data was on the concept of the "mentor." In general, the mentors themselves had positive reactions -- they liked the Seminar idea and enjoyed the discussions with students and interacting with them in a small class setting.

At the same time, the students had almost no discouraging words about the mentors and the way they ran the classes — the mentors encouraged discussion, were open to all points of view, and were personable. However, this should not be surprising. We assume that the mentor groups were highly select and inclined in the direction of student interaction.

On the other hand, while mentors had a positive experience, we do not know what the cost-effectiveness of their participation actually was, i.e., what faculty, staff and student mentors might have been doing, if they had not been involved in the Seminar. Naturally, such "hidden expenses" are a constant even if they tend to arise more often in new and experimental programs.

Student Outcomes

Findings regarding student outcomes were generally supportive of the Seminar, but were not always consistent and clear.

At the end of the quarter, the majority of students had a considerable amount of information about how the university works and about the "mechanics" of student life. That the same could not be said regarding their knowledge of academic options was disappointing, but difficult to assess without a comparison group. Students tended to articulate their academic plans more clearly and had considered the nature of the "educated" person and their relationship to the university. However, there was some evidence that they were less educationally "autonomous."

The assessment by the mentors of the low quality work turned in by many students was unsettling. This was reinforced by the students' own admission of not putting "a great deal of effort" into the course.

We suggest two contributing reasons for the data suggesting the student outcomes were less than expected: 1) incongruent expectations and 2) lack of mentor time. The first of these, incongruent expectations, has been a topic throughout the report. We conclude that, in general, students expected less work in the Seminar, primarily because the class was described as a talk-oriented, information-dispensing experience; because of this expectation, they attained less than what was possible. We assume they usually devoted such time as could have been spent on maximizing the Seminar experience on courses where assignments, reading, and projects were routine and expected.

A second and related cause may have been lack of time on the part of mentors to plan assignments, select readings, and guide projects. This is not to suggest mentors were negligent, but rather to suggest that the lack of planning time (and the fact of overload) probably contributed to unclear directions and uncertainty of assignments, a situation students probably

used to postpone the placement of energy into the Seminar.

At the same time, the evaluation committee must assume some responsibility. We are not convinced that some of the inconsistent findings related to student outcomes was not, in some part, due to the nature of our translation of goals and objectives into constructs measured by our experimental tools.

The Seminar and Accountability

What the Seminar can be held accountable for is the key to making statements about the relative success of the endeavor. Since we believe that the Seminar proposers probably did the Seminar a disservice, at times, by using high-minded rhetoric in their proposal, we have chosen to suggest that the Seminar should be held more accountable for certain goals which can be attained within the Seminar and less accountable for concepts for which there is obviously broader responsibility. The Seminar cannot be all things to all people.

In terms of those specific Seminar goals for which the Seminar should be held accountable, e.g., discussion, information, knowledge of options, etc. the Seminar could be labeled "moderately" successful. In terms of broader goals that were implicit, if not always explicit in the proposal, we are less able to make any statement with certainty; for example, one especially "disquieting" piece of data found student relationships to the university to become more complex, but also more alienating. Even though some changes were "positive" (e.g., more students saw themselves as learners), many were "negative" (e.g., twice as many students at the end of the quarter saw themselves as a "number" or a "paying customer" than they did at the beginning of the quarter). We do not believe the Seminar should be held

accountable for the direction of such changes, but rather the University as a whole should be. To a degree, this evaluation did study the entire first quarter experience of the freshmen, not solely of the University Seminar.

A Concluding Comment and a New Paradigm

We have already suggested that the data support the notion that the Seminar was moderately successful. We would add to that statement some qualifiers - there were some dissenting data; there is much we don't know about, especially regarding how non-Seminar students fared; and while there were problems, most can be corrected.

Before turning to our recommendations for "correcting" the Seminar, we would venture one final thought. Had the Seminar been developed more closely along a process-product paradigm, it might be judged more sucessful than it has been here.

ESSENTIALLY, WE BELIEVE THE SEMINAR IDEA SUGGESTS A PROCESS ORIENTATION: MEETING PEOPLE, DISCUSSING IDEAS, CHANGING DIRECTIONS, CLARIFYING PLANS, AND UNDERSTANDING RELATIONSHIPS. THESE PROCESSES HAVE CERTAIN "PRODUCTS" IN MIND--AN AUTONOMOUS, INDEPENDENT, PURPOSEFUL LEARNER. HOWEVER, THAT "PRODUCT" CANNOT BE THE RESULT OF THE SEMINAR. AT BEST, THE SEMINAR CAN CONTRIBUTE TO THAT PRODUCT; IT SHOULD NOT AIM AT BEING EVALUATED ON THE IMMEDIATE DEVELOPMENT OF THAT PRODUCT. TO DO OTHERWISE RESULTS IN UNREALISTIC THINKING ABOUT WHAT CAN AND CANNOT BE ACCOMPLISHED VIA THE SEMINAR.

Recommendations

As a result of the knowledge we have gained through this evaluation, we have made nine recommendations for changes and modifications in the University Seminar concept. These recommendations cited below are not of

equal weight nor do they imply equal amounts of time and energy in pursuing them. We have, however, not ordered them in any way; we believe they all can be done and should be done to make the Seminar a more effective and efficient program.

1. PROPOSAL SHOULD STATE SEMINAR GOALS MORE CLEARLY.

The Seminar proposal needs to be rewritten for reasons made clear throughout the report. Language that is clear and specific about what the Seminar is attempting to do and not attempting to do would be helpful to students, mentors, and evaluators. Using the process-product paradigm discussed above is one way that might be used to reconceptualize the Seminar.

2. SEMINAR EXPECTATIONS CLEARLY COMMUNICATED TO STUDENTS.

Basically, this recommendation asserts that academic advisors and others who counsel students to take the Seminar should accurately advise the student about the nature of the course, and especially about expectations regarding active participation and the student workload.

3. MENTOR PREP/RATION/WORKSHOP

Some form of mentor preparation should be considered. As well as giving the mentors a handbook, a spring and an early fall workshop or seminar using "experienced" mentors to discuss the purposes and problems of the Seminar would appear helpful.

4. A STRUCTURE FOR RESOURCE PERSONS.

Given the popularity and effectiveness of resource persons, it would seem some structure for maintaining resource person availability should be

designed. We assume their interest will decline as the novelty of the program wears off.

5. STUDENT PROJECTS SHOULD BE INTRODUCED EARLY.

The idea and work associated with student projects should be introduced no later than the first or second session of the Seminar; it is doubtful the quality of student work will improve if more time and attention is not given to them.

6. REVIEW SEMINAR READINGS AND TOPIC SEQUENCE.

The nature of the readings "required" of students needs to be reviewed as well as the placement of the "philosophical" aspects of the Seminar. It seems these discussions would be more effectively handled toward mid-quarter when students have some college experience under their belt.

7. EMPHASIZE GOALS OTHER THAN INFORMATION.

Students should receive considerable information about campus services and "how the university works"; but because of the ease with which it can "displace" more difficult Seminar tasks, its role in the Seminar can be overemphasized.

In light of students' interest in choosing courses they should take, and fewer students knowing academic options than we expected, more time could probably be spent on the discussion of group requirements, how to make wise choices within that model, and the alternatives to traditional courses and modes of fulfilling group requirements. Such alternatives may be field-based courses, credit-by-exam, and the notion of "curricular sequences" recently developed by the University Division.

8. NEXT YEAR'S EVALUATION SHOULD BE MORE FOCUSED AND CONTROLLED.

The evaluation of next year's program should differ from this year's by placing less emphasis on describing what happens and more emphasis on the results of the Seminar and the relationship of those results to the broader goals of the University.

In order to do this, of course, the goals of the Seminar must be more specific (as indicated above) and concepts need to be clearly translated into student outcomes. The most important new element for next year must be the inclusion of a group of students not taking the Seminar. The question of how well similar groups of students "transit" into the university needs to be known in order to establish the relative worth of the Seminar.

At the same time, we recommend a strategy that would also include the intensive study of 2-3 Seminar sections and/or 25-30 randomly chosen students to determine what might be "lost in the averages." We suspect that knowing more about how some representative students related to the Seminar in an in-depth manner would be at least as productive as gathering data on 400-500 new students. In sum, next year's evaluation should include a comparison group of students and be more intensive within the Seminar sample.

9. CONSULTING WITH OTHERS.

Those responsible for continuing to develop the University Seminar idea should be meeting with others during these formative months. It seems only reasonable to assume that the Seminar will be judged useful and effective when it is seen as contributing to the attainment of the broader goals of the BGSU community. Only when there is some composite

of what faculty, staff, and students want as the end result of a university education and experience will the Seminar be able to articulate a meaningful program to facilitate development along those lines.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSAL FOR THE CREATION OF A UNIVERSITY SEMINAR PROGRAM
(Abstract)

Introduction:

During the fall quarter of the present academic year, a number of faculty members and students participated in a quarter-long symposium entitled, "The Future of Education at Bowling Green State University," which was sponsored by the Office of Experimental Studies. It quickly became obvious to the participants that one of the most neglected areas within the University is the freshman year experience. It was suggested that a quarter-long seminar devoted to the operations of the University and to academic life in general for incoming students would be desirable. The concept of such a seminar was in no way intended to supplant or otherwise compromise existing or planned orientation programs. Rather, the seminar was suggested as a means of providing incoming students with an informal but structured exploration in some depth of the various opportunities and options open to them as members of the Bowling Green State University community.

Goals and Objectives:

The purpose of this program would be to provide new students, both freshmen and transfer, with a more humanistic introduction to Bowling Green State University than they are presently receiving,by organizing them with a small group of peers, a faculty member, a staff member and an upperclass student. The mentor team, composed of the faculty member, staff member and upperclass student, would serve as a resource group interested in the individual student's needs and objectives.

The program would also serve to develop a students' self awareness through articulation of individual goals and objectives of their individual educational experience and how it may relate to future plans. The program would also attempt to develop an awareness of how the individual can maximize his/her use of the institution, the curriculum, and the resources to the fullest extent -- thus meeting personal goals and objectives. And finally, the program could provide new students with a forum within which to share their opinions, concerns, and questions concerning the college experience.

An Overview of the Program:

1. The seminar would carry two credit hours and students would be encouraged to exercise their S-U option.
2. The seminars would be scheduled during normal class hours.
3. The size of each seminar would be approximately twenty students.
4. An evaluation system would be utilized to insure an experiment with controls and directions.
5. Faculty, staff, and upperclass students acting as mentors, while not receiving pay for their services,would receive appropriate recognition.

General Syllabus:

The following syllabus would be suggested as guidelines for use by each of the seminar groups:

Week One: Introduction centering around discussion of the goals and objectives of the seminar.

Week Two: The functions of Higher Education and nature of a University. Students will be encouraged to consider their attitudes and values about education.

Week Three: The Administrative organization of the University and proper channels to obtain information and present proposals, requests,or appeals.

Week Four: Support services available to students (ie. Counseling Center, Fact Line, etc.) and available "hardware" on campus such as audio centers, etc.

Week Five: A discussion of how General Education (group requirements) can be a meaningful part of a student's total educational experience along with how a student can exercise his/her options in the existing structure.

Week Six: Classroom dynamics, different teaching techniques, grades, competition and test taking.

Week Seven: General decision-making processes and how these can be applied to making a career choice. Exploration of various campus opportunities in career development. Discussion of academic advising structure.

Week Eight: Recreation and avocational skills that will develop the foundation for lifelong learning to occur.

Week Nine: Free week where more indepth discussion/debate of one or more of the previous topics can occur.

Week Ten: Sharing of individual student projects and conclusion; commentary by the group.

Requirements:

1. Students will be asked to complete a project as evidence of their learning experience. Examples of such projects would be: an essay on a student's personal plan for an education, a personal journal, short papers, a non-paper product - such as a film or tape recording, or a "logged" reading program.
2. The committee members also felt that reading assignments should be part of the seminar program but that students should be allowed a great deal of choice from a fairly wide-ranging bibliography that would be provided to them at the beginning of the seminar.

Conclusion:

The committee members sincerely hope this program will do a great deal to provide new students with an organized and yet informal introduction to many of the options and opportunities available to them on this campus. Miracles are not expected; but predictable improvements are. Students should graduate from Bowling Green State University knowing that they have utilized as many of the University's facilities and faculties as were humanly possible during their tenure on this campus. The committee members hope that this seminar program will result in a better informed student body, staff, and faculty; for positive results should be visible among all three groups who will have shared common academic experiences unrelated to disciplines or traditional curricular paths. For two hours each week during one quarter, all three groups will have devoted themselves to an investigation of the nature of this institution and how it has served, is serving, and can serve its many members. This proposal, the committee members feel, is not only academically sound, but humanistically ecological as well. The net result should be an improved educational environment at Bowling Green State University.

APPENDIX B

University Seminar Program Mentors (Fall, 1975)

Faculty	Staff	Students
Black, Jay	Adams, Rose	Adair, Sherry
Brecher, Arthur	Caldwell, Lee	Bottonari, Dennis
Burke, Richard	Carek, Roman	Boyle, Patrick
Champion, Ernest	Carsey, Seldon	Cross, Bill
Doherty, Mike	Conover, Susan	DeAugustinis, Jim
Eakin, Richard	Douglas, JoAnn	Falkenbach, George
Kivlin, Joe	Eckel, Hal	Feverston, Lynn
Kuhtz, Mary Lee	Fitzgerald, Patrick	Hill, Connie
Marsden, Michael	Hart, Kathy	Hooker, James
Magada, Virginia	Ketzer, John	Jones, Patricia
Means, Charles	Krone, Jane	Kaverman, Richard
Meyers, Robert	Lanning, William	Kimpel, David
Morton, Bea	Lewton, Kethy	Kistler, Denise
Obee, Harold	Litwin, James	Lamanna, Vicki
Perry, Robert	Miller, Nancy	Mazanec, Susan
Peterman, William	Ogden, Linda	McLaughlin, Michael
Phillips, Trevor	Pajonk, Trina	Moormeier, Jennifer
Robb, Kenneth	Reid, Larry	Myers, Greg
Rivera, Rosendo	Richardson, Jerry	Novak, Linda
Roberts, Ruth Jane	Schlesinger, Mark	Obert, Loren
Saddlemire, Gerald	Simmons, Bob	Shimko, Dennis
Shrestha, Mohan	Smith, Hazel	Shinew, Michelle
Wood, Peter	Venema, Kathryn	Thomas, Beth
Wygant, Nancy	Wheeler, Joe	Trytek, David
Zanger, Beverly		Warnke, Cindy
		Webner, Pam
		Wisebaker, Deb
		Wolfarth, Jan

UNIVERSITY SEMINAR PROGRAM

Selected Characteristics of Mentors

Faculty	Staff	Students
Male 19	Male 14	Male 12
Female 6	Female 11	Female 16

Departments	Offices	Colleges
English (4)	Residence Programs (5)	Arts & Sciences (3)
Educational Foundations & Inquiry (3)	Counseling Center (2)	Business Administration (13)
Sociology (3)	University Division (2)	Education (10)
Ethnic Studies (2)	WBGU-TV (2)	Health & Community Services (2)
Geography (2)	Admissions	
Chemistry	College Office, Arts & Sciences	
College Student Personnel	College Office, Education	
Journalism	Commuter Center	
Library	Competency-Based Undergraduate Education Center	
Mathematics	Computational Services	
Physical Education & Recreation	English Advising Office	
Popular Culture	Environmental Safety & Health	
Psychology	Environmental Studies Center	
Speech	Financial Aids	
Non-departmental (2)	News Service	
	Placement	
	Scheduling	
	General Studies Writing	

APPENDIX C

1975 UNIVERSITY SEMINAR STUDENT INFORMATION FORM

The information in this form is being collected in order to achieve a better understanding of the students who are participating in the University Seminar. Your individual response will be held in strictest confidence. Identifying information has been requested in order to make subsequent follow-up studies possible.

Your Social Security Number: _____

Your University Seminar Section Number: _____

1. Which of the following reasons is <u>most true</u> regarding why you decided to enroll in the Seminar? (CHECK ONE ONLY)

___ The advisor I talked with at Summer Preregistration convinced me.

___ My own reading of the material describing the Seminar convinced me.

___ I thought a course with two hours of credit would easily fit into my schedule.

___ Someone else besides the advisor at Summer Preregistration convinced me it was worthwhile.

___ The people who direct my program of study <u>strongly</u> encouraged me to enroll.

___ My parents brought the Seminar to my attention and encouraged me to enroll.

___ I really can't say how I got enrolled in the Seminar.

2. You probably have some expectations of what you will get out of the Seminar or what it will be like. Please place a check next to the <u>three most</u> descriptive phrases which reflect your expectations. Please feel free to write in others which may not be in the list.

___ To learn about extracurricular activities.

___ To learn about "group requirements."

___ To get information about services on campus.

___ Meeting other students.

___ To learn how the university works.

___ Getting to know a professor.

___ Involvement in a <u>new</u> program (the Seminar).

___ A <u>small</u> classroom setting.

___ To learn about academic options like credit by exam, off-campus study, etc.

___ To understand how I "fit in" the university.

___ To discuss the purpose of "going to college."

___ To receive two more credits.

___ To plan my college program.

___ To learn what the university has to offer.

___ To ease my transition into college.

___ An opportunity to ask questions.

___ To get advice on "how to survive" in the university.

___ To help in making decisions about a career.

___ To decide on some goals and objectives for myself.

___ To help in making decisions about a major.

Any other expectations? Please explain in the space below:

3. We would like to know something about your academic plans, that is what academic goals, degrees or honors you hope to attain, what set of courses or other experiences you hope to employ to reach them, and what kinds of skills and knowledge you hope to gain from your university experience. Please summarize your "academic plans" in the space below.

4. Universities like to say that they produce "educated people." Please list below what you think are the characteristics of an educated person.

5. Students may define their relationship to the university in different ways, that is they may see themselves as learners, explorers, seekers, paying customer, a number, member of a community, trainee, etc. How would you describe the relationship you expect to exist between you and the university?

6. How much importance do you attach to getting good grades? (check one)

___ Little or no importance.

___ Important, but not as important as other things, such as social activities.

___ Important, but other things, such as social activities, are equally important.

___ More important than anything else because your future depends on it.

7. Which of the following statements comes closer to your views? (check one)

___ There are bodies of knowledge to be learned, and college faculty should direct the student's course of study through required courses, prerequisites, etc.

___ College students should be given great freedom in choosing their subjects of study, and in choosing their courses within their subjects.

8. How much have you thought about the questions, "Who am I? What do I Want? What will I Become?"? (check one)

___ A great deal; this is the thing I think about most.

___ I think about it quite frequently.

___ Rarely, only occasionally.

___ Not at all — I have always taken myself pretty much for granted.

9. Which of the following two types of classes do you prefer?

___ A class that stresses the student's independence even though assignments may be vague and the student unsure about what's expected of him/her.

___ A class that stresses clear requirements even though it may restrict the student's independence.

10. Please indicate the extent of your agreement with the following statements using the key:

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

___ a. Students who do well in school are different mostly in their ability to "play the game."

___ b. The better students in school probably have greater academic ability than the students who do poorly.

___ c. Students could hold class sessions even with professors absent.

___ d. It matters little to me whether my professors hold PH.Ds.

___ e. A poor class experience can usually be attributed to the instructor's lack of ability.

___ f. Students have as much responsibility for a good class experience as teachers.

___ g. Many of the troubles students experience are a result of bad luck.

(Continued on Next Page)

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

___ h. It doesn't much matter what I do in most courses -- it comes out the same anyway.

___ i. Students could have more control over their school experience if they expressed greater initiative.

___ j. The open-door policy of many colleges waters down the educational experience for most students.

___ k. I don't understand why colleges are run the way they are.

___ l. I will be glad when my education is completed.

___ m. I do my best in school because a lot of people would be let down if I failed.

___ n. Tests measure real learning.

___ o. My feelings about the instructor have little to do with my ability to study a subject.

___ p. I am not sure why I came to college.

___ q. Small group discussions in class are little more than shared ignorance.

Some Questions About Your Background --

11. How old are you? ____ years

12. Sex: ____ Male ____ Female

13. In which college are you enrolled?

___ Arts & Science
___ Education
___ Business
___ Musical Arts
___ Health & Community Services

14. If you have decided upon a major, what is it? If you have not decided upon a major, please write "undecided." _____

15. Where are you living?

___ Residence Hall
___ Apartment or Mobile Home
___ Live with parent (s) or relative (s)
___ Sorority or Fraternity house
___ Other

16. Approximately, how large was your high school graduating class? _____

17. Do you have any particular career or occupation in mind? (check one)

___ Yes, it's fairly definite
___ Yes, but it's only tentative
___ No, not even tentatively

Thank you for your cooperation!

APPENDIX D

1975 University Seminar Student Information Form A

The information in this form is being collected in order to learn more about the University Seminar Program. The information gathered will be used to evaluate the course and modify it in the future. Your individual response will be held in strictest confidence. Identifying information has been requested in order to make subsequent follow-up studies possible.

Your Social Security Number: _____

Your University Seminar Section Number: _____

1. Which of the following is most true regarding how your experiences with the University Seminar compared with your original expectations? (CHECK ONE ONLY)

   ____ There was more work involved (reading, projects, etc.) than I thought there would be.

   ____ It was pretty much like what I expected.

   ____ There was less work involved (reading, projects, etc.) than I thought there would be.

   ____ It differed from my original expectations in several ways (including the workload).

2. Please place a check next to the three most descriptive phrases which reflect what you got out of the Seminar. Please feel free to write in others which may not be in the list.

   ____ Learned about extracurricular activities.

   ____ Learned about "group requirements."

   ____ Got information about services on campus.

   ____ Met other students.

   ____ Learned how the university works.

   ____ Got to know a professor.

   ____ Was involved in a new program

   ____ Had a small classroom setting.

   ____ Learned about academic options like credit by exam, off-campus study, etc.

   ____ Came to understand how I "fit in" the university.

   ____ Discussed the purpose of "going to college."

   ____ Received two more credits.

   ____ Planned my college program.

   ____ Learned what the university has to offer.

   ____ Eased my transition into college.

   ____ Had an opportunity to ask questions.

   ____ Got advice on "how to survive" in the university.

   ____ Helped in making decisions about a career.

   ____ Decided on some goals and objectives for myself.

   ____ Helped in making decisions about a major.

Did you get anything else out of the Seminar? Please explain in the space below:

3. We would like to know something about your academic plans, that is what academic goals, degrees or honors you hope to attain, what set of courses or other experiences you hope to employ to reach them, and what kinds of skills and knowledge you hope to gain from your university experience. Please summarize your "academic plans" in the space below.

4. Universities like to say that they produce "educated people." Please list below what you think are the characteristics of an educated person.

5. Students may define their relationship to the university in different ways, that is they may see themselves as learners, explorers, seekers, paying customer, a number, member of a community, trainee, etc. How would you describe the relationship you expect to exist between you and the university?

6. How much importance do you attach to getting good grades? (check one)

___ Little or no importance.

___ Important, but not as important as other things, such as social activities.

___ Important, but other things, such as social activities, are equally important.

___ More important than anything else because your future depends on it.

7. Which of the following statements comes closer to your views? (check one)

___ There are bodies of knowledge to be learned, and college faculty should direct the student's course of study through required courses, prerequisites, etc.

___ College students should be given great freedom in choosing their subjects of study, and in choosing their courses within their subjects.

8. How much have you thought about the questions, "Who am I? What do I Want? What will I Become?"? (check one)

___ A great deal; this is the thing I think about most.

___ I think about it quite frequently.

___ Rarely, only occasionally.

___ Not at all -- I have always taken myself pretty much for granted.

9. Which of the following two types of classes do you prefer?

___ A class that stresses the student's independence even though assignments may be vague and the student unsure about what's expected of him/her.

___ A class that stresses clear requirements even though it may restrict the student's independence.

10. Please indicate the extent of your agreement with the following statements using the key:

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

___ a. Students who do well in school are different mostly in their ability to "play the game."

___ b. The better students in school probably have greater academic ability than the students who do poorly.

___ c. Students could hold class sessions even with professors absent.

___ d. It matters little to me whether my professors hold PH.Ds.

___ e. A poor class experience can usually be attributed to the instructor's lack of ability.

___ f. Students have as much responsibility for a good class experience as teachers.

___ g. Many of the troubles students experience are a result of bad luck.

(Continued on Next Page)

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

____ h. It doesn't much matter what I do in most courses -- it comes out the same anyway.

____ i. Students could have more control over their school experience if they expressed greater initiative.

____ j. The open-door policy of many colleges waters down the educational experience for most students.

____ k. I don't understand why colleges are run the way they are.

____ l. I will be glad when my education is completed.

____ m. I do my best in school because a lot of people would be let down if I failed.

____ n. Tests measure real learning.

____ o. My feelings about the instructor have little to do with my ability to study a subject.

____ p. I am not sure why I came to college.

____ q. Small group discussions in class are little more than shared ignorance.

11. If you have decided upon a major, what is it? If you have not decided upon a major, please write "undecided." _____

12. Do you have any particular career or occupation in mind? (check one)

____ Yes, it's fairly definite
____ Yes, but it's only tentative
____ No, not even tentatively

13. Section 1. This section gives you an opportunity to express your views of the Seminar and how it has been taught. Please check the one response closest to your view for each item.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree
a. The purpose and objectives for the Seminar were made clear	____	____	____	____
b. There was agreement between the announced purpose and objectives of the Seminar and what was actually taught	____	____	____	____
c. Class time was used well	____	____	____	____
d. Students were encouraged to think for themselves	____	____	____	____
e. In the Seminar I felt free to ask questions or express my opinions	____	____	____	____
f. The mentors were well-prepared for each class	____	____	____	____

(Continued on Next Page)

13. (con't)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree
g. I put a good deal of effort into the Seminar	___	___	___	___
h. The mentors were open to student viewpoints	___	___	___	___
i. I had an opportunity to pursue individual interests in the Seminar	___	___	___	___
j. The mentors seemed to be interested in students as persons	___	___	___	___
k. The Seminar was too philosophical	___	___	___	___
l. More courses should be taught this way	___	___	___	___
m. I would encourage all new students to BGSU to take the Seminar	___	___	___	___
n. The Seminar was informal and personalized	___	___	___	___
o. The Seminar emphasized practical information too much	___	___	___	___
p. The grading policy for the Seminar was made clear	___	___	___	___
q. The Seminar would be better if it were taught by only one instructor	___	___	___	___
r. The Seminar, overall, was quite useful	___	___	___	___

Section 2. Check one response for each item.

	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor	Doesn't Apply
a. Overall, I would rate the required books	___	___	___	___	___	___
b. Overall, I would rate the supplementary readings	___	___	___	___	___	___
c. I would rate the general quality of lectures	___	___	___	___	___	___
d. I would rate the overall value of class discussions	___	___	___	___	___	___
e. I would rate the overall value of the resource persons (outside speakers)	___	___	___	___	___	___
f. I would rate the value of the student project	___	___	___	___	___	___
g. I would rate the overall value of this course to me as	___	___	___	___	___	___

(Please Continue)

14. Listed below is a series of resources, options, places, programs, etc. associated with BGSU. Would you please indicate the extent to which you are familiar with each of these items by placing an X under one of the three responses following each item?

Secondly, please write in the parentheses after each item where or to whom you would go for information on that item if you needed to get such information. Listed immediately below are some possible sources of information with a corresponding code. If the source that you would go to is included in this list, use the code letter to refer to it; if the source that you would go to is not listed, write the source in the parentheses; if you don't know where you would go for such information, leave the parentheses blank for that item.

A = Another Student
B = Resident Advisor
C = Faculty Member
D = Academic Advisor
E = College Office
F = Department Office
G = University Division of General Studies
H = Office of Experimental Studies
I = Library
J = Counseling Center

I AM FAMILIAR WITH:	Not at All	To Some Extent	To a Major Extent	Source of Information
S-U Grade Option	___	___	___	( )
Financial Aid	___	___	___	( )
Programs of Study Abroad	___	___	___	( )
Drop-Add Procedures	___	___	___	( )
Grade Point Average	___	___	___	( )
Board of Trustees	___	___	___	( )
CLEP Test (College Level Exam Program)	___	___	___	( )
Career Placement	___	___	___	( )
Periodicals	___	___	___	( )
Time-Flexible Degree	___	___	___	( )
LINK	___	___	___	( )
Group Requirements	___	___	___	( )
Reserve Books	___	___	___	( )
Academic Probation	___	___	___	( )
Mark of I (Incomplete)	___	___	___	( )
Independent Study	___	___	___	( )
Registration	___	___	___	( )
General Education	___	___	___	( )
Little College	___	___	___	( )
Prerequisites	___	___	___	( )
Faculty Senate	___	___	___	( )
Cluster Colleges	___	___	___	( )
Academic Freedom	___	___	___	( )
General Fees	___	___	___	( )
Graduation Requirements	___	___	___	( )

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

APPENDIX E

UNIVERSITY SEMINAR

WEEKLY REPORT

In order to facilitate the growth and development of the Seminar Program, it is necessary to have a general record of what happens in the various sections. Each team is asked to submit this weekly report for that purpose.

Seminar section: Week (1-10):

I. What topics were covered during this session?

II. What procedures or methods were used (lecture, discussion, role playing, guest speaker, film, etc.)?

III. Did any problems occur (or do any exist) of which the seminar committee should be aware?

IV. Did any procedure seem unusually effective or worthwhile? Please describe.

Please mail to: University Division of General Studies
26 Shatzel Hall

Submitted by: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX F

Bowling Green State University

College of Arts and Sciences
University Division of General Studies
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
(419) 372-0202

December 1, 1975

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Seminar Mentors

FROM: University Seminar Evaluation Committee
(R. Burke, J. Litwin, R. Stoner)

SUBJECT: University Seminar Summary Report

In order to complete our account of the first year of the University Seminar Program, we are asking for one more investment on your part. While we have information on student perceptions of the Seminar, and your weekly reports, and that is all very useful, our last request strives to gain from you a more synthetic, integrated image of what the University Seminar was all about. Rather than repeating the type of information you've sent us on a week by week basis (topics, methods, problems, etc.) we would like you to be, for the great part, reflective and critical of the University Seminar while discussing its basic strengths and weaknesses.

While not emphasizing the "nuts and bolts" of the Seminar, there may also be some utility in rephrasing what you've already given us in overall terms (so that we have your version of how the weeks added up), for example, the method that worked best was ...

Another element we would find useful, and which can simply be appended to your Summary Report would be a listing of student projects (with an asterisk next to those especially worthwhile), and any syllabus-type object you generated.

We would prefer your report to be no more than three (3) pages. It should also be a statement of the three mentors, if possible. Dissenting opinions might be noted, certainly not discouraged. Listed below is a series of questions which you can attack one by one, simply use as a guide, or disregard if they do not serve the overall purpose of a wholistic version of the Seminar you created and experienced. Ideally, we would like to have the reports by the end of December. If that is not possible, please use January 9 as a deadline.

Reflective/Critical Component	"Nuts and Bolts" Component
The Basic Character of our Seminar?	The Usefulness of the Mentor Handbook?
Major Outcomes for the Students?	The Readings?
Necessary Deviations from the Proposal?	The Mentor Team Concept?
Should Students Receive Two Credits for the Seminar?	Mentor Preparation?
	Meeting Times and Places?
The Future of the Seminar?	Most Persistent Problem?
Impact on the Mentors?	

PLEASE RETURN TO THE UNIVERSITY DIVISION OF GENERAL STUDIES (26 Shatzel).

APPENDIX G

Distribution of Enrollment According to Course Credit Hour

Credit Hours	Group A-UD 121		Group B-1975		Group C-1974	
	Students	SCH	Students	SCH	Students	SCH
1	361	361	320	320	321	321*
2	469	938	36	72	52	104*
3	117	351	182	546	176	528#
4	751	3004	836	3344	786	3144#
5	393	1965	425	2125	478	2390#
Totals	2091	6619	1799	6407	1813	6487
Ave. # of courses per student	4.92		4.23		4.27	

Distribution of Students by Total Credit Hours Registered

Total Load	Group A-UD 121	Group B-1975	Group C-1974
less than 10	0	11	7
10	2	3	2
11	4	2	1
12	10	15	11
13	9	23	11
14	28	82	81
15	123	118	127
16	175	68	77
17	60	61	76
18	10	36	25
more than 18	4	6	7
TOTAL	425	425	425

APPENDIX H

DIRECTIONS

In order to assess student change in the University Seminar, it is necessary to evaluate the content of student responses to questions asked of them before and after the ten-week seminar. Included in this package of materials are a set of student responses to three short-essay questions. For each student essay (there are three on a page) there is a corresponding set of scales for you to mark.

After reading a student's response to a question, please mark the corresponding scales for that question to indicate your perception of the content. These scales may not seem appropriate for evaluating every response, but they are the result of much discussion and analysis by the Evaluation Committee. If you cannot fit the student's response into the scale, then please mark "doesn't apply." This response, however, should be used rarely.

In order to provide practice and to give you a sense of the typical responses to these questions, we have included a few practice sets and responses which are not a part of our sample. Please read these responses and mark the appropriate scale for each before going on to the next practice set. When you finish the practice sets, you should be ready to read each response in your sample and to evaluate it with reference to our scales. Please mark each scale by circling the appropriate number.

Definitions

The phrases below further describe what is meant by the keywords used on the coding form. Wherever possible, student responses should be coded either in categories 1 or 3 as described here. The words "More Like This" have been used to label these categories so that an answer can be placed in them without meeting the exact description.

The answer "intermediate or both" should only be used when the response clearly cannot be placed in one of the other and is an intermediate response, or combines both answers.

Q.3. Academic Plans

Plans and goals are definite, and clearly stated. "I would like to get a B.A. in Music and teach."	Intermediate or Both	Doesn't know, or unsure about plans or goals. Vague. Plans not related to goals or vice versa.
Plans are job oriented or career-related. Limited goals and plans. No plans beyond college are indicated	Intermediate or Both	Plans oriented toward personal or general development such as "meeting new people" or "want to find out what I want to do." Some plans or goals beyond college are indicated.

Q.4. Educated Person

Description in terms of ends or results such as "successful," "has a good job" or "Nobel Prize winner."	Intermediate or Both	Description in terms of skills, qualities, and characteristics such as "knows where to get information," "well-rounded," or "is tolerant."
Educated person is seen as knowledgable, credentialed, has a B.A., Ph.D. etc., "intelligent." Past tense is emphasized.	Intermediate or Both	Educated person is seen as involved in social-political affairs, continually learning seeking, or doing Present tense is emphasized.
References vocational and/or specific terms such as 'does well in job, or field, or special area"	Intermediate or Both	References personal and/or generic (broad) terms such as "knows self" or "can adapt to new situations"

The student's response to questions three (academic plans) and four (educated person) represents thinking which seems:

	More Like This	Clearly Intermediate or Both	More Like This	Doesn't Apply
Q.3. Academic Plans	Articulated Clearly	Intermediate or Both	Not Articulated, Vague	
	1	2	3	0
	Vocational, Narrow, Short-Range	Intermediate or Both	Personal, Broad, Long-Range	
	1	2	3	0
Q.4. Educated Person	End-State, Achievements	Intermediate or Both	Skills, Attributes	
	1	2	3	0
	Learned, Credentialed	Intermediate or Both	Learning, Doing/Active	
	1	2	3	0
	Vocational, Specific	Intermediate or Both	Personal, Generic	
	1	2	3	0

Q.5. University Relationship

Please check the responses the student used to answer this question; in cases where the student used "other," please list the responses:

____ Learner	____ Member of Community	____ Doesn't Apply
____ Explorer	____ Trainee	
____ Seeker	____ Other (list below)	
____ Paying Customer	_____	
____ Number	_____	

Comments:

Appendix I. Grade Distribution*

Grade	Number	%
A	109	25
B	85	19
C	25	6
D	4	1
F	4	1
S	187	43
U	7	2
Incomplete	6	1
Missing	10	2
Total	437	100

*Eleven students were granted a WP (Withdrawn Passing)

Authors

James L. Litwin
Staff Associate for Research and Evaluation,
University Division of General Studies

Richard R. Burke
Assistant Professor,
Education/Foundations and Inquiry

Ronald E. Stoner
Professor,
Physics